



House of Commons Debates.

SPEECH

OF

S. E. GOURLEY, K.C., M.P.

ON THE

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY

AND

THE TRADE ROUTES OF CANADA

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1st, 1903.

OTTAWA
OTTAWA FREE PRESS PRINT
1903.

7.

0 800547

Hous. of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

SPEECH

OF

S. E. GOURLEY, K.C., M.P.

ON THE

GOVERNMENT'S GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY POLICY

OTTAWA, SEPTEMBER, 1st, 1903.

THE RIGHT HONORABLE THE PRIME MINISTER moved for leave to introduce a bill to provide for the construction of a National Trans-Continental Railway.

House resumed debate on said motion.

Mr. SEYMOUR E. GOURLEY (Colchester). Mr. Speaker, if this debate shall have the effect, of turning the attention of Canadians, to the study of the geography of Canada, and to the physical features of our country as related to the question of transportation, it will have answered a very high and national purpose.

THE MAIN PROPOSITION.

The Right Hon. the Prime Minister submitted his scheme to the House, on the main proposition, that it was a national railway from ocean to ocean, and also upon three subsidiary propositions. He felt that perhaps his main proposition might be refuted, and

being an old parliamentary hand, he commenced to hedge, and he called to his support these three subsidiary propositions to which I shall refer. These subsidiary propositions are: First, the fear of the abrogation of the bonding privilege; second, that this railway was to be a common highway; and third, that it was to relieve traffic congestion in the West. In the course of the debate, the subsidiary propositions have been practically eliminated, so that the scheme of the government rests upon the main proposition; that this is to be a great national highway from ocean to ocean, and that it can be justified as such.

A COMMON HIGHWAY.

The subsidiary proposition, that this is to be a common highway, might be justified, but upon investigation the grounds on which it was sought to be justified, turn out to be utterly untenable. I have undertaken to inquire into the arrangement between the Wabash and the Grand Trunk Railway, which

was quoted as a justification for the use of this road as a common highway, and I find that these two systems draw their trade and their traffic from different sources, and only unite for 200 miles to get to a common market. I can understand that two great railways, which tap two different districts and which are not competitors for trade, can join in a common highway running to a common market, but is it possible that two great transcontinental railways, struggling in the same territory for trade, could have a common running arrangement over such an extensive system? Why, Sir, every man on each system must struggle for his own railway, and it would be utterly impossible, that there could be any joint user, on a transcontinental line of that sort. That proposition, however, has been practically eliminated from the debate, by the common consent of the House, so that I need not refer to it further.

THE BONDING PRIVILEGE.

Now we have heard a great deal about the bonding privilege in this House, and I am glad that my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) asked that the English language should be used accurately in describing that arrangement. Speaking for the maritime provinces, I want to tell you, that what you call a privilege, we regard as a curse. If I thought that by voting against this scheme of the government and defeating it, we could get rid of that bonding curse, I would most cheerfully, cast my vote against it, so strongly do I feel that the bonding arrangement is a degradation to the maritime interests of Canada. The bonding arrangement means that the people of Ontario, and the interior of Canada, are permitted to use American ports, instead of our own Canadian ports. It

is a degradation of the commerce of Canada, to the commerce of the United States; and my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) understood it thoroughly, when he showed, that the people of the United States, knew better that the Prime Minister of Canada, the real secret of that arrangement. It was an attempt, in the early days, on the part of the United States, to win and to dominate the trade of Canada. When it was thought, that Canada was fair game, for the political system of the United States, this bonding treaty was one of their schemes, to dominate Canada, and to control our great country in respect to trade. It was a subtle way, to ultimately capture the political destinies of this country. I for one, say, that it is time for us to reconsider our position in this matter, and if negotiations should be opened, I trust that our Prime Minister, will say to the Americans, abrogate that bonding treaty at once, for we in Canada feel that the time has come when we should use our own ports. Gentlemen of Ontario, you are largely responsible for this bonding arrangement. Before Confederation, it was one of the evils of those days, that your Grand Trunk Railway system, found an ocean port outside of Canadian territory. In the early days, away back in 1854, the people of Ontario, instead of refusing to use an American port, instead of sending their delegates down to the maritime provinces, to combine their commercial interests with ours; consented to allow the Grand Trunk Railway system, which you were subsidizing, to find its outlet at Portland. Confederation came later, and now we have new sentiments and new aspirations. I address myself to that subject, as a maritime province man, with great feeling, when I say, that we regard that bonding system, as

depriving the people of the maritime provinces, of the just right, they have to carry on the commerce of this country through the Atlantic ports of Canada. I shall gladly vote against this measure, if my Right Hon. friend is able to convince me, that its defeat would result in the abrogation of the bonding treaty. I remember, that years ago, men went around with bated breath, and said: don't say anything to the Americans or they will abolish the reciprocity treaty. Well, Sir, the time came when the reciprocity treaty was abolished, and the people of Canada found, that instead of it being a benefit to this country, it had been a bondage. They found that it fettered the ambition, and the national life of this country. And Sir, until Canada attains such national strength and power as to be able to dictate to the United States, I shall never consent to another reciprocity treaty; because I believe that any reciprocity treaty that could be arranged now, would be at the expense of the reputation and material interests of this country. Fifty years hence, when Canada is strong, and I hope the dominant nation, then if the United States desire to negotiate with us, we will enter into negotiations with them; but not till then. The bonding privilege, is of the same sort as the reciprocity treaty. Let it go tomorrow, and if it did go, then twenty-four hours afterwards, we would have a better position in the eyes of the world, and we would be able to exploit our own ports, and depend upon ourselves, to manage our own trade.

THE MAIN PROPOSITION.

Now Sir, having disposed of these subsidiary propositions I will deal with the main proposition of the Right Hon. gentleman. He told us, that if this railway, is to be justified at all, it is to

be justified on the ground that it is a national railway from ocean to ocean. I am prepared to vote for a measure of that sort, if upon analysis, it answers the description which the Right Hon. the Prime Minister gave of it.

A RAILWAY MAN.

I am a railway man; I believe in railways. I want railways, built in every portion of this country, and if this were a mere provincial railway, if it were a railway to relieve the congestion in Manitoba, if it were a railway to help New Brunswick, I would hold up both hands in support of it. During this very session, Mackenzie & Mann came here, for a large grant, for a railway in Manitoba and the North-west Territories and I voted for it. I have always advocated this parliament giving every province all the aid that is essential to its proper development. We in Canada, are only at the beginning, of the building of railways, and the giving of subsidies to promote the building of railways. I am not in sympathy, with a large number of the leading weekly and daily papers of Ontario, which say that the time has come, when the bonusing of railways should cease. On the contrary, I think we are just at the threshold of the bonusing railways in Canada.

THE TEST.

Now, the test which I am going to apply to this question is this: does this railway offer the best possible solution of the transportation problems of Canada? Because, when you come to deal with a great national highway, involving an expenditure of one hundred or two hundred millions of dollars, you should test it not by the consideration whether it will aid one province or another, or whether it will supply one

province or another with railways. We could probably do that, with a fiftieth part of the expenditure, involved in the present scheme. But if this measure is based on the highest development of the transportation system of Canada, then I am one to say, that no amount of money, that can be asked, for the exploitation of such a scheme, should be refused by this parliament. But before I take that ground, I have to ascertain whether this scheme answers the demand, of a great trans-continental highway, which will solve the transportation problems of Canada? If this great policy is not well based, then the proposition to spend two hundred millions of dollars is criminal folly.

WHEN PARLIAMENT OPENED.

When this parliament opened, and I heard the announcement in His Excellency's speech that a commission was to be appointed in reference to the transportation facilities of this country, I felt that we had arrived at a stage of development, that was singularly fortunate.

UNFORTUNATE IN OUR ROUTES.

You know, we have been unfortunate down to this time, in developing, our transportation routes. Confederation came very late. Before we were confederated, all our transportation routes, had merely a local and provincial outlook. What has happened in the United States? They were confederated for a hundred years, and all their transportation routes, had the broad, continental outlook, embracing all the States, and developing, in the highest degree their national system of transportation. After Confederation, we built the Inter-

colonial Railway; but at that time we had only the four provinces. We had not the Pacific province, nor the great Lone land; and the first step we took, for the building of a highway, to unite the Provinces, had merely a provincial, eastern outlook. What happened? It is admitted, that that railway was not located as a commercial highway. At that moment, the military idea was dominant, and I believe it was right. I believe, that if we had only one railway today, in the maritime provinces, it should be located exactly where the Intercolonial Railway is; because, in the case of trouble—and we must always look out for that—it affords us powers of defence. It lies along the St. Lawrence, where a British man-of-war, could protect, every mile of it, from assault. Therefore, if to-day, we had only one railway, its location would be justified, because it is a fair commercial highway, and an excellent military highway.

THE C. P. R.

Then the Canadian Pacific Railway was located. At that time the opposition were not treating the railway problems of the country, as we treat them to-day. After Confederation, when the Conservative government undertook the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, they were met with a most systematic and unreasonable opposition. The result was that the parliament of Canada, could not treat the Canadian Pacific Railway, as the highest settlement of the transportation problems of Canada, but they located it, where they could. At that time too the people of Canada were weak financially, and, worse, they were weak in a national sense. Therefore, this parliament had to struggle against the greatest difficulties, and they lo-

cated that railway where they could—near the frontiers of the United States, and by a line, that makes it a longer route than is necessary, and not, in the highest sense, one of the best transportation routes of Canada. It has, of course, been of enormous benefit to Canada. It has developed the trade of Canada. It has been, the greatest immigration agency, Canada ever possessed, and it has been a great university for Canada, The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, organized great companies, and sent them abroad, to England and to Europe, to educate the people of the world, in reference to Canada, and to help roll back that tide of slander, which for a hundred years, had crippled this country.

UNFORTUNATE CANADA.

No country, has been so unfortunate, as Canada. No country has ever had the unfortunate history, that Canada has had. For example,—Canada, had always, four great enemies. We had, first, the Hudson Bay Company. That great company, powerful and rich, had numerous and very strong shareholders in England and Scotland. What happened? They wanted to keep, the greater part of Canada, shut up to promote their business interests. The result was, that every officer of the Hudson Bay Company, who came down to Montreal, and every shareholder in the company, were instructed to say, that the whole country was a frozen zone, unfit for the habitation of man. Consequently, we had that company working against the best interests of Canada. Then we had the hostility of the United States, who sent its immigration agents throughout the whole world, repeating the same story, about the climate of Canada. Then, the public men and the people of England gave us the cold

shoulder. And, what was perhaps worse, than either the Hudson Bay Company or the United States or even the cold shoulder of its people and public men of England, was that the Liberal party of Canada, down to the year 1896, men of power and ability going up and down throughout this country, slandering Canada, holding out to the world that Canada was unfit to be a nation, and in every way, trying to misrepresent us abroad. I say to the Prime Minister and his colleagues to-night: Gentlemen, if you are repentant, and are now good citizens of Canada, I do not regret the revolution which befell my party in 1896; if holding Offices, will make you good citizens, I thank God, you hold them. However, what is the position of these hon. gentlemen to-day? And when I come to that, I will test their policy by the strong position they occupy. There never was a government in this country that could enter upon a stronger transcontinental policy, free from little political pulls, free from grafters, and free from every influence except the high influence, that should prevail upon a government in dealing with a great problem like this.

FREE TO ACT ON NATIONAL LINES.

This is the first government that has been free to act in this matter on high national lines. Therefore, I will hold the Prime Minister and his policy down closely to the lines he laid out, when he declared that this must be a true national policy without any appeal to provincial or local issues, and intended to serve only high national interests. We are to-day, Sir, strong in the fact that we are a more united Canada than formerly. We enjoy a most enviable position both at home and abroad. We are strong in our splendid buoyant re-

venue, which enables us to stand up here or anywhere, and evolve a policy, and back that policy financially, without fear of reverse.

A NATIONAL SENTIMENT.

And what is better than all, we have an increasing and vitalizing national sentiment in this country. What we lacked in the past, was a national sentiment from one end of the country to the other, which could rise above local prejudices and interests, and looked to the development of Canada as a whole. Go where you will, to-day, you will find this vitalizing sentiment. I recollect when poor Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper were wearing themselves out, striving to create a national sentiment in this country, there was an innocent young man, now the Finance Minister, who was going up and down Nova Scotia, harranguing against confederation and proposing to snatch the province of Nova Scotia from the clutches of Canada. I remember often being frightened, at the drastic measures that gentleman was advocating. I used to wish that we had three or four railways connecting Nova Scotia with the other provinces, because I feared that some day he would break that little iron band, the Intercolonial Railway, and tear the whole province from confederated Canada. I would assume that the hon. gentleman was guided by the loftiest motives, but I recollect having had many an anxious hour, when that movement was going on, fearing it might succeed. There was also some time later, a little kick up in the North-west, the rebellion of the Metis, which had the sympathy of the First Minister. I do not know that he had anything to do with it personally, but in the province of Quebec, he used to make splendid speeches on behalf of the rebels. And if any stray Metis

happened to be around the public halls, when the right hon. gentleman was addressing meetings at that time, he would no doubt have borne back to his benighted brethern, the idea that it was the duty of his compatriots to rebel against that infamous statesman, Sir John Macdonald, and his infamous government. In fact, we never had a strong healthy sentiment in this country, so long as these hon. gentlemen were flouting their discontent in opposition. But as soon as they were elected to power and shut up in the public offices, they changed their tune and the whole country became united Canada, from one end to the other. That change in the national sentiment of hon. gentlemen opposite, their conversion, their casting aside of their former pessimistic views and anti-national ideas, is about the only thing upon which we can congratulate the country since their accession to office. For my part having no particular care for office—I would rather occupy an independent position in parliament where a man can say what he believes, which is the most precious right on earth, a right a cabinet minister is about the last man to possess—I congratulate them on the striking change. The right hon. the First Minister and his colleagues are the first government in Canada which has ever been in a position, backed by a strong national sentiment, enjoying a splendid revenue, and the patronage and affection of the people of England—because that has come to us at last—this is the first government that has ever been in a position to bring forward a broad measure of national policy in the fullest sense of the term. I am going to criticise this railway policy to see whether it is really a national policy in the highest sense, and if I find that it answers that test, I will support this Bill, if not I

shall oppose it with the utmost strenuousness.

THE FIRST QUESTION.

The first question I put is this. Does this measure offer the best solution of our transportation problems? If it does, I shall not carp about the expenditure. If it answered the purpose, I would not care if it cost \$300,000,000. I have every confidence in the position of Canada, and I hope I will make it clear that I know something about the geographical and physical position and the trade routes of this country. When the announcement that a transportation commission would be appointed, was made, I began to think that this government was perhaps more worthy of support than I had previously imagined. In the appointment of a commission, I thought it was taking the best means of arriving at a correct solution of the problem before us.

MERE PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS.

Our railways have been in the main, mere provincial affairs, without any national outlook up to the present. But now we are in a position to take a broader view and see that our railways are constructed on the most scientific and correct basis from the national point of view. The best course to pursue, in order to arrive at a correct solution, would have been to appoint a commission, or better still, have an inquiry made by this House. Why, at one time we had the whole parliament of England investigating the great problem of transportation. Experts were called before the bar of the House in order that the members of parliament might have the views of these experienced railway men at first hand. I thought that the wisest course for the Prime Minister to have pursued

would have been to follow the precedent set by the British House of Commons and have the evidence submitted direct by the parties themselves to the members of this House. We could well afford to spend one or two months on the inquiry. We could have brought experts from Germany and the United States and every country in the world, who would make themselves acquainted with the geographical and physical features of Canada and give us the benefit of their views. Then we could have arrived at a decision as to what transportation routes we should lay down; then we could push the work forward unhesitatingly. No matter what such an inquiry would have cost, the expenditure would have been a wise expenditure, in order that we might satisfy ourselves, as to the best course to pursue, before undertaking the investment of \$100,000,000 or \$200,000,000 in a transportation enterprise?

THE TIDE WOULD NOT WAIT.

But my right hon. friend said that the tide would not wait. Well, we know that in Nova Scotia. We are familiar with the fact down there, and in telling us that the tide would not wait, he was not giving us much information. But sometimes tides will wait a little. They always wait on the wise, and it would have been better to have waited three, or even six months, in order to possess ourselves of the most ample information before entering upon this vast undertaking. Had the Prime Minister waited to get this information, he would have avoided, what I regard, as the initial mistake in his policy.

THE NECESSITIES OF CANADA.

What are the necessities which this proposed railway are intended to meet?

I assume that the Prime Minister has laid down this measure upon the broad, national ground of a national highway intended to solve the greatest national problems that confront the people of Canada to-day.

Then, let us see what they are? The first problem that Canada should consider in connection with a national transcontinental railway, is whether we are able to carry the trade of the Orient, whether we are able to dominate that trade? Secondly—but subsidiary—will this road dominate the carrying trade of Canada so as to carry all our imports and exports, through our ocean ports on the Atlantic and Pacific?

MUST DOMINATE BOTH OCEANS.

For this railway must dominate both oceans. I am not here to advocate simply the exploitation of our Atlantic harbours; I am here for the exploiting of our Pacific harbours also. Thirdly—mark me, for if I am right in the previous propositions, this follows as a mathematical result—the carriage, of the whole imports and exports of the United States over Canadian routes and through Canadian ports. If we can dominate the trade of the Orient and the trade of our own part of the continent, we can dominate the trade of the whole continent; the control of the trade of the United States follows, *ex necessitate*, the trade of the Orient. And, fourthly, the dominance and supreme control by Canada of the commerce of both the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans.

FOUR PROBLEMS.

These are the four problems to be kept in view in considering a Canadian transcontinental route. Now I would ask my Right Hon. friend, if these con-

ditions are met; I would ask him if his experts have advised him that this is the best railway that can be laid down in Canada to solve these questions? If so, this is the great national railway and should be supported by every man in Canada.

IS CANADA A NATION?

But this whole proposition is based on the question whether Canada is a nation? This question, I have heard argued on many occasions in this House and it is a question which should be finally settled by this country. While I am a strong Canadian, while I have the greatest faith in the destiny of Canada, I say at the present time, Canada is not capable of being made a nation, under the circumstances in which we find ourselves. We have a thin fringe of population, around the shores of Nova Scotia, along the shores of the St. Lawrence, along the Lakes, and along the Canadian Pacific Railway to British Columbia—a long thin line of population. Sir, if that is the extent of Canada, if that is the utmost area that can be populated in this country, we can never be a nation; we have too much breath and not enough depth; no national life could grow in vigour upon such lines. The whole question of a national railway depends upon the question, of whether we have depth of country? What are the physical features; what is the physical trend of the continent, and what do these say, as to Canada becoming a nation? We must interrogate the geography, for we cannot become a nation if nature has determined otherwise. Have we depth of territory in which to make a nation in British North America? That question was asked a long time ago in the legislature of Nova Scotia by a very eminent statesman, Joseph Howe. Nova Scotia had no union then with the other

provinces, and we could not tell what this great country up here would amount to in the future. I may differ from Hon. Gentlemen on this side, and from Hon. Gentlemen on that side, but I contend, that the first consideration in the building of a great national railway, is to find out whether we have depth of country, whether we have 300 or 400 miles of territory to the north, that is fit for the abode of white men, that is fit for the reproduction of white men, that is fit for the business that white men conduct in the manner in which they conduct it, to reach the highest objects of civilization? If we have not depth of country in Canada, it is idle talk about national railways; it is idle talk about exploiting great questions of this kind. If, as was believed years ago, we could never have more than a thin fringe of population, the building of a nation here would be impossible. In this connection, let me refer to a statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in the debate on the budget last April, when that hon. gentleman contended that Canada, geographically was but an annex to the Mississippi Valley. At the time, I indignantly repudiated that statement. I quote from Hansard:

Mr. CHARLTON. These two countries are geographically one. Our North-west is geographically a portion of the Mississippi valley.

Mr. GOURLEY. I deny that.

Mr. CHARLTON. The province of Quebec is geographically as nearly allied to the New England states as to the mouth of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. GOURLEY. The United States is geographically an annex of Canada.

Mr. CHARLTON. The province of Ontario has its nearest route to the sea across American territory.

Mr. GOURLEY. No man who studies the map, could make such a statement. Study the map of North America, and you will find that the United States is geographically an annex of Canada.

Mr. CHARLTON. Then the annex has got a little ahead of the main body. The two countries, I repeat, are geographically one.

Mr. GOURLEY. Never.

I respect the learning of the hon. gentleman. When I entered this House, I was impressed with his research and the extent of his information. And these things are creditable; they are what we expect of members of this House, and what we admire in them. But when I found the hon. gentleman wobbling on almost every question; when I found him seconding a resolution in relation to the Boer war, which was hostile to every feeling of an Anglo-Saxon, I felt that that hon. gentleman was an unsafe guide, though, apparently possessed of great intelligence. But, when, in a speech in this House, he struck at the hopes and the affections of this country, by stating that Canada was a mere annex to the Mississippi valley, I felt convinced that he was not the student, not the scholar, I had taken him to be. Had he been what I at one time thought him, he would have directed his attention to ascertain the true teachings of geography. No man is fit to be a public man in this country, who does not know the course of every river of Canada, and the lesson it teaches. The Hon. Gentleman from North Norfolk misread the plain teachings of the geography of

this country. Your ancestors, Mr. Speaker, knew far better—the French pioneers—knew, that the trend of the continent, was to the North and North-East, and not to the South.

A GREAT DEBATE.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the first thing that we Canadians should do in a great debate of this kind is to ascertain whether Canada has the capacity to be a nation, for, as far as I am concerned, if I should find that the hon. gentleman's reading of the geography of this country is correct, I would say: let us abandon the attempt. I am a strong Canadian and a strong imperialist, but I would say that you cannot fight against Nature, against the geography, the physical features of this continent. In this great debate, I want to put on record what I take to be the true principle, that should be laid down, with regard to the geography of this continent. I do not know whether the British representatives who sat upon the commission, that drew the 49th parallel, were intelligent men or not, but I am bound to say that the American commissioners who settled on that parallel, as the boundary, were the more capable students of the geography of this continent. Some people have thought, that that 49th parallel, was settled by hap-hazard. I venture to say, that if you study the geography of Canada, you will find that there is a perfect physical division of this continent along the 49th parallel, and the United States commissioners, being possessed of much more geographical information, than the British commissioners, pushed their boundary up to the head waters, up to the source of all the streams, running south on this continent. They pushed the boundary up to the head waters of the three great river systems, the Missouri, the Missis-

sippi and the Ohio, that bore the commerce of the United States, to the Gulf of Mexico; and in doing that, they believed, that they had obtained all of the continent that would ever be fit for human habitation. They believed, that all beyond, the 49th parallel, where the waters flowed to the Arctic ocean, and the great Hudson Bay valley, was an absolutely Arctic country, unfit to support civilization. The Americans went home after settling that boundary and said: We did not get up to 54:40, at which we desired to place the boundary, but we got everything fit for human habitation in North America. They thought, that they had left a mere fringe, and then they proceeded to inculcate that doctrine, among the people of this continent, even in Canada. I remember in my boyhood, being deterred from remaining in Canada by the thought, that we had no scope for national life in this country.

THE 49th PARALLEL.

I undertake to say that the 49th parallel, marks two great physical and geographical and political spheres on this continent. If you look at the map, you will see one set of great rivers, flowing one way, to the south, and the other set of great rivers, flowing to the north, one through a southern country and one through a northern country. If the boundary after following the 49th parallel, from the Pacific Coast, had left that parallel at the western boundary of North Dakota, and had run down through Northern Minnesota—for the Red river, which runs through Manitoba, and empties into Lake Winnipeg, and gives Manitoba its magnificent wheat valley, takes its rise in Minnesota, just north of the Mississippi—there are two lakes there, the Mississippi rises in one and flows south, the

Red river rises in the other and flows north—if, I say, the boundary had cut down between these two lakes in Minnesota and had run thence to the East through Northern Wisconsin to the Sault St. Marie we would have had a perfect, geographical and physical division, of this continent.

A PERFECT PHYSICAL DIVISION.

As it is, there is practically a perfect physical division. When my hon. friend undertook to say that Canada was a geographical annex of the United States, he was all wrong, because Nature has set upon the face of this continent two great physical divisions, and intended these two great physical divisions for two Peoples, with different verges and scopes, marked out for different civilizations. I do not believe we can blend them. When hon. gentlemen used to talk, about our trade going to the United States, they did not understand that the commerce of this continent, has a north-east route marked out for it, as distinctly as can be by Nature, and that unless the people of the United States beat us by superior railway transportation, we will be able to dominate their trade. The United States can never dominate our trade, if we exploit our routes with intelligence.

THIS DEBATE 50 YEARS AGO.

This debate should have occurred, fifty years ago, in order that the people of Canada, should have thoroughly understood, and appreciated, the impregnable commercial position they occupy on this continent. You will see, Mr. Speaker, that had it not been for railways, if the era of railway development had not come, the United States would have been entirely out of the transportation business, as far as the Old Coun-

try is concerned, because all their great rivers, the Mississippi, the Missouri and the Ohio, would have borne their trade down to the Gulf of Mexico, and the result would have been, that the whole trade of the United States, would have been taken south and away from the great commercial centres of Europe.

GREAT ENTREPOTS OF TRADE.

We must remember that the great entrepots of trade are away north of Canada, and if the United States, to-day had to trust to their natural trade routes, they would not, have the slightest chance, of competing with Canada, because our trade routes run in a North or North-Easterly direction. Look at the course of the St. Lawrence, it points North-East as the course our trade routes should take. The trade routes of this country should be all North-East. Any trade route in this country, that goes South-East, is against the natural trend; and entirely and unnecessarily, lengthens the trade routes of Canada. These trade routes, should go as far North-East, as the geography of the country will permit, in order to get as near as possible the great commercial nations of Europe; because while our average latitude is 47, the average latitude of England, the great world market, the great distributing centre to which the goods of all the world go, is north of the 50th parallel. Therefore, every trade route in this country, to be scientific and natural, and to develop the highest efficiency, must be North-East. Cartier and the early French explorers, who discovered the St. Lawrence river, realized, the extraordinary position, that that river occupied, in reference to the future development of this country.

I want the teachings of my hon. friend from North Norfolk, with refer-

ence to the geography of this country, to be utterly and forever repudiated. I recognized, that he spoke very intelligently last year in regard to the geography of South Africa, and I am truly sorry that he is not, as familiar, with the geography of Canada. It is a matter of regret, that we Canadians have studied, the geography of every country but our own; that is one of the most unfortunate things in the history of Canada; but I trust, that hereafter, the geography of this country will be more thoroughly understood.

CANADA A SEPARATE NATION.

I have said that the trade routes of this country, that the physical geography of this country, indicate that Canada, should be a separate physical, geographical and political entity.

Now, that is all very well. But the people of the United States, believed that when they settled the boundary at the 49th parallel, they left Canada only a narrow fringe of habitable territory. But though they were mistaken at that time, and although we have room for national aspirations, we never would be able to realize them, if we contented ourselves, with a country 3,000 miles in breadth from one ocean to the other, and only forty miles in depth, without national strength or power.

LAKE WINNIPEG.

This railway, therefore, to be a national railway, ought to be thrown back, to within 100 miles of James bay. It ought to be thrown back, North of Lake Winnipeg, and it ought to proceed West, from the mouth of the Saguenay. That is practically the Trans-Canada route, to which every man coming from the maritime provinces, has been committed. If this route is to be followed, which is of the

highest national advantage to the country, it will start at Port Simpson and proceed eastward in a line north of Lake Winnipeg, 100 miles south of James bay and out at the mouth of the Saguenay. I am not even concerned whether it would be a failure commercially or not, for the first 5 or 10 years: because I am satisfied that it would settle the question of national capacity, in Canada for all time to come. Standing here, I cannot assume that the country to be traversed by this road, is not a country rich in its possibilities. Build that railway, throw it back to within 100 miles of James Bay and to the north of Lake Winnipeg and we shall exhibit to the world, that we have great depth of country, that we have 400 miles of rich territory North of where I now stand, and if it proves to be as rich in agricultural resources as it has proved to be in mineral and timber wealth; then we can triumphantly repel the accusation, which has been made against Canada for a hundred years, that we were not a nation, and could not become a nation; because, we lacked depth of habitable soil.

THE GEORGIAN BAY.

Mr. MURRAY (of Pontiac). I have listened very attentively, to the hon. gentleman's very able address, and I would like to ask what he has to say, in regard to the geography, of the Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal. He has spoken of the St. Lawrence route, and I would like to hear him particularly, upon the Georgian Bay canal route.

Mr. GOURLEY. I would be very happy to assist, in developing the Georgian bay or any other route, if it is possible by the development of that route, to aid Canada's trade in any way or form. If the Right Hon. leader of the government, had carried out his plan,

to have experts from Germany and the United States brought here, they could have been placed upon that route, for three or four weeks, to examine it, and report upon its possibilities. I want to exploit every available route in Canada. We must not put all our eggs, into one basket. If we fail in one direction, let us exploit another, until we determine what are the great trade routes of Canada. I am sorry, I cannot follow the Right Hon. the Prime Minister, because my province has forbidden me to vote for any transcontinental route that goes south of Lake Winnipeg. The hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) must vote against the scheme which has been proposed by the government and every hon. gentleman from the maritime provinces must vote against it.

Mr. EMMERSON. How about the alternative scheme.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am prepared to support any wise alternative scheme.

Mr. EMMERSON. How about a mandate from the province?

THE RIGHT ROUTE.

Mr. GOURLEY. Now, I have told the House about the route, that I think the railway should take. It shou' go through the Peace River valley an the Rocky mountains to Fort Simpson. I have a friend who spent some time in California, and he said that the universal opinion years ago in San Francisco was, that we had at Port Simpson, the best port on the Pacific ocean. The people of San Francisco, thought that we were a very sleepy people, in not undertaking to exploit that port, and attempting to take away their trade from the East. The people of the United States, owing to our physical advantages, in connection with the

Pacific ocean and the trade of the East, have developed the ports of San Francisco and Seattle, and now they fear that they will be eclipsed, because they see that Canada is waking up. I have no doubt of the great resources of the country which would be traversed by the route I have outlined. I went carefully over the whole of the evidence in regard to the Trans-Canada Railway last year. I have been reading every book, obtainable upon that country for the last ten or fifteen years, and am thoroughly convinced, notwithstanding everything that can be said to the contrary, that the route from the mouth of the Saguenay through the country 100 miles south of James bay, north of Lake Winnipeg and through the Peace River valley, would afford a railway, that in three or four years would prove a commercial success. That is practically the route of the Trans-Canada, and if that railway had been built, the national status of Canada would have been settled, particularly if the country traversed by it turns out to be the valuable agricultural and mineral country that we suppose it to be.

THE HUDSON BAY.

Then, it would put us in touch, with Hudson Bay. We have there one of the greatest inland seas, in the world, and if any man looks at the geography of Canada, he must see there the possibility of an enormous trade; because it is the greatest body, of inland water outside of the Mediterranean, and it must have been put there to serve the highest purposes in the development of this country. We must recollect, that the information that has trickled down to old Canada, from that region, has come largely through the Hudson Bay Company's officials, and

we must remember also that every official of that company was charged upon his honour, and upon his word, to misrepresent that country, to say that it was a frozen country and unfit for habitation; otherwise, the 150 per cent dividends, which the shareholders of that company received might not longer be paid. A great deal of the information that we have to-day, has come from some missionary or traveller whose mouth was not sealed, and who had no interest in misrepresenting it. But, we have heard a great many stories about that country, which will turn out to be, just as ill-founded, as some of the stories which a few years ago were told about Manitoba and the country to the West. I heard just as lamentable stories about Manitoba, and the West, when the Canadian Pacific Railway was planned, as I have heard about the Hudson Bay country.

THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

Now, I find that a very intelligent man, Colonel Church, has made a statement, in regard to the route, which I have advocated. I believe that he was associated in some way with the Trans-Canada project. He is a scholar and a student and from the fact that his writings are accepted by the 'Fortnightly Review,' we must conclude that he is a very able and accomplished man. That gentleman has studied the trade routes of Canada, and I desire to read two or three lines from an article written by him, and in this connection, I would ask hon. members of this House, to read "The Trade Routes of Canada," in the 'Fortnightly Review' for March, 1903; which I am bound to say is the first thorough and systematic discussion of that subject, which has been attempted. Colonel Church, says, with reference, to this Trans-Canada Railway :

"The Dominion has reached a point in its growth where it requires a commercial and political backbone; but Lake Winnipeg dominates the situation; and if all the future products of the North-west have to move south, to round that sheet of water before they can be sent eastward, the bulk of them will seek the Atlantic ports of the United States, rather than turn again to the east and north to reach the ocean. Hence, Lake Winnipeg must be flanked on the north by a railway through the heart of the country."

That is the difficulty I find in supporting this scheme, and that is the difficulty the people of the maritime provinces find. Lake Winnipeg, as large as Lake Ontario, 260 miles long, lying north and south, lies right across the track of all the transportation routes of Canada, east and west. The south end of that lake lies 65 miles from the American border, and into that narrow strip, you must crowd all your transcontinental railways, if you run them south of Lake Winnipeg. As a consequence, our country could be broken in two at any moment. A great army from the other side, could, in a few days, occupy that sixty-five miles of territory, take control of our railways, and our country would be cut in two, and we would be beaten in detail.

Mr. EMMERSON. How does the scheme of the leader of the opposition obviate that difficulty?

REASONS AGAINST PRESENT SCHEME.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am giving reasons why I cannot vote for the scheme of the government, which proposes to cast on the people an enormous expenditure, for a great transcontinental railway, that will not answer a high national purpose. I am showing, that the proposition of the government, is

unscientific and un-national and not a man of you should support it. I will deal with the proposition of the leader of the opposition later, but in the meantime, notwithstanding the speeches of the hon. gentlemen from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) and Hants (Mr. Russell) and Annapolis (Mr. Wade), I will undertake to say, that they do not represent, the feelings of the people of Nova Scotia; because I find that in that province there is universal opposition to this scheme, owing to its location south of Lake Winnipeg. In dealing with this matter, I take my stand on the highest national lines. Even suppose we had ten transcontinental railways, in that narrow strip, south of Lake Winnipeg, an army could break up these railways, and conquer us in detail. I tell these gentlemen, opposite, from the maritime provinces, that unless they desert the position they have taken on this question, the people of the maritime provinces will call them to account for misrepresenting their sentiments. These gentlemen talk about the congestion of traffic.

CONGESTION OF RAILWAYS.

Why, if you look at the map of Manitoba, South and West of Winnipeg, it strikes me that there is a congestion of railways in that district, and not a congestion of traffic. The whole system, of railway development in that country, has been unscientific, and this railway, that the government is now proposing, is the most unscientific of them all, because it takes the products of the North-West, South of Lake Winnipeg, and into the dangerous area of Lake Superior, whence, we never can hope, to get them to the maritime provinces.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

I will agree that there is need for an-

other transcontinental railway. I have argued that in Nova Scotia, and my voice is the same in Nova Scotia, as it is in Quebec, as it is in Ontario, as it is in the West, and as it is in every part of Canada. I am not as unfortunate as hon. gentlemen opposite, who possess a voice for Quebec, a voice for Ontario, and a voice for the West. I have but one voice, for Canada. I want another transcontinental railway, but I say that that railway should be laid upon lines that are highly national, and that are intended to make of Canada, a Nation. We must throw this railway, north of Lake Winnipeg, and we shall then have a depth of at least 400 miles and a breadth of 3,000 miles, upon which we can rest for ever, upon which we can maintain, in comfort, millions and tens of millions of contented people.

THE TRADE OF THE ORIENT.

Now, Mr. Speaker, unless this railway goes by the shortest possible route across the continent we can never hope to dominate the trade of the Orient; and I say further, that the chief aim of commerce now, is to endeavour to monopolize the Oriental trade. I undertake to say, that, if we did get the trade of the East, as it is possible for us to get it, Canada within a few years would not only be a great commercial power, but it would be the dominant commercial power of the world. What has been the history of the trade of the Orient? Every nation, from the dawn of time, which controlled the trade of the East, became the commercial, the political, and the imperial Mistress of the world.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. Yes, gentlemen who know, the history of the world, will know that. Some people think, that the growth of these nations was

accidental, but the fact is, that they were the creatures, of their geographical position, in relation to the trade of the Orient. They grew rich and powerful, and their history has come down to us. The first great commercial nation of which we have a record is Babylon. What made Babylon great?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. I desire for a moment, to call your attention to the commercial history of the world. Babylon became great, because the trade routes of the world, at that time, were commanded by Babylon. She dominated the trade of India and China; she was the furthest nation west on the Tigris; the trade routes then did not extend to the Mediterranean; they extended to Babylon, and she was the great entrepot of the East, of India and Cathay. Babylon was as strong in her day, as the United States is to-day, as England is to-day, and she owed her supremacy entirely, to her command of the trade routes of the world.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. Yes, and if you are students you will draw valuable conclusions. Then the trade extended west to the Euphrates, Babylon fell, and Nineveh became the great metropolis of the world. At this time the population of the world was going westward to Europe, and the trade passed to Tyre and Sidon on the Mediterranean, which became the great commercial centres of the world, as London and New York to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. To those, who are unacquainted with the history of the

world, this will appear novel; but the whole history of the world, rests on the trade routes, and the whole history of Canada, must rest on her trade routes.

ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES.

The great struggle, going on in this world to-day, is between England and the United States, to command the trade of the world. The country that commands the trade of the East, whether it be England or the United States, will be for the time, the Mistress of the world. In the fifteenth century, the whole world, was attempting to find its way to the East. Canada was discovered, in an attempt to find a trade route to China. When Jacques Cartier came out from France, and sailed up the St. Lawrence, he was not hunting for Canada; he was hunting for a highway to India and Cathay, in order to dominate those trade routes. Therefore, Canada, is peculiarly dedicated by her history, to a discovery of the proper trade routes of this continent. Cartier, 400 years ago, understood the trade drift of this country, infinitely better than do the gentlemen, who sit on the opposite side of this House. I have said that when Nineveh, captured the trade routes, from Babylon, Babylon fell and Nineveh grew. Then Tyre and Sidon captured the trade routes. Then Alexander appeared upon the stage. He was a better commercial man, than any hon. gentleman opposite, and he wanted to make his own little country, Greece, great. He soon made conquest of Persia, Nineveh and Babylon, and took possession of all their trade routes. Then he founded Alexandria. As he found, that the populations of the world were filling up Spain and France and Eng-

land, he turned the trade routes to Alexandria, and it grew to be a great Metropolis, while Tyre and Sidon declined and fell. Then the trade routes crossed the Mediterranean and came into the possession of Rome, and Rome became the Mistress of the world. Greece had held them, not as a country of Europe but by virtue of her possession of Alexandria. After the fall of the Persian Empire, Alexandria and not Athens was the commercial capital of Greece. Then Rome captured the trade routes of the world, and Greece fell. In the fifth century Rome in turn went down. Then the dark ages set in, and from 500 till 1,500, during which the trade routes were forgotten or lost. But immediately, the dark ages passed away, in the fourteenth or fifteenth century, Columbus and other great explorers, began searching again for the trade routes of the East, and discovered this continent in the attempt. From that moment this continent became dedicated to the trade routes. What happened? Venice and Genoa held them for a while, Spain for a while, then Holland, then France; and finally the trade routes were captured by England, and she has held them for 125 years.

WHAT IS HAPPENING NOW?

But what is happening now? For twenty years the people of the United States have been girding themselves to capture the trade of the East—because their statesmen and public men are students, and they know that if they can capture the trade of the East, they will possess themselves of the wealth of the world, which will give them power, and they will be Masters of the sea and land. For the last twenty years the United States have been making the most tremendous exertions—doing what? Establishing

great ports at San Francisco and Seattle, and putting a fleet of steamers on the Pacific ocean. Now they are trying to build a canal, to cut the continent of America, so as, all the more firmly, to establish their trade route to the East. Morgan, as a part of the game, is attempting to establish a syndicate, to capture the trade of the Atlantic.

The Civil war familiarized them with the geography of their own country, and immediately after the war they began to build railroads, until now they have 200,000 miles of railways, cutting up their country, in all directions, and giving them the advantage of every trade route they possess. While we have been sitting by these hundred years, never taking a well considered step towards developing the trade routes of Canada. The United States in consequence have an enormous advantage over us; at the same time, owing to their southern position, when we have anything like a scientific development of our trade routes, notwithstanding their enormous advantage of a hundred years start in the race, I believe the physical trend of this continent, is so strongly against them, that even now, we can put Canada in the position, in which she would have been, had we been a competitor against them for all these long years.

NOT IRREPARABLY PREJUDICED.

Canada has not been irreparably prejudiced by her long delay. It is for us now to look around, and say whether we are going to play this game out, or whether the United States is going to win on this continent? Because there is no doubt that the struggle in the United States to-day is to capture the trade of the East from England. The trade of the East seems to be coming

to this continent. Any man who sits down, and notes the trend of that trade, will find that even the Suez canal, is not the dominant factor to-day in that trade, but that the trade of the East, instead of finding its way to England and Europe by the Suez Canal, is coming to this continent, either to San Francisco to Seattle, or to our coast. It ought to come to our coast for we have enormous advantages, both by sea and land, for capturing that trade. Now, then, Mr. Speaker, we propose, say, to dominate that trade. The United States are proposing to dominate it. The vital question then comes, who has the better geographical position with reference to that trade? Because geography will in the end settle it. The first question you ask is, where are the great markets which that trade seeks? Suppose it comes to Canada, when it does come, is that trade to be taken north or south? If it is to be taken north, then Canada has an enormous advantage, because her situation is north. If South America, were to be the Entrepot for the trade of the East, then the United States, would have an enormous advantage from her geographical position; but when the trade routes are all north of Canada, all the advantage lies with us. If by a line, from Port Simpson, to the mouth of the Saguenay, or a branch to Quebec, and across the St. Lawrence to the Atlantic ports, we can dominate that trade, the result would be worth all the expenditure necessary to attain it.

SOME FIGURES. THE PACIFIC OCEAN.

I will now, give a few figures, to show you that on both oceans, owing to our northern position, we have an enormous advantage over the United

States. Supposing trade starts from Yokohama; take the Pacific ocean first:

	Miles.
From Yokohama to San Francisco	4,530
From Yokohama to Port Simpson	3,810

Difference in favor of Canada... 720

Suppose you started from Yokohama, you would have an advantage of 720 miles between Port Simpson and San Francisco. Seven hundred and twenty miles, would, as a rule, settle any particular route, but we have an equal advantage on the Atlantic coast. Plymouth is one of the coming ports of England.

	Miles.
New York to Plymouth	2,000
Halifax to Plymouth	2,430
In favour of Halifax	500

So that on the Atlantic ocean we have a gain of 500 miles, and on the Pacific a gain of 720 miles, making on the two oceans a gain in favor of Port Simpson and Halifax over San Francisco and New York of 1,280 miles. I am very pleased to be able to tell my hon. friend from Caribou (Mr. Galliher) that his province, if he will help me to exploit a true national railway, will be one of the wealthiest of the world, in ten or twenty years, provided we are able to dominate this trade of the East, because the whole wealth of the world has always followed that trade.

QUEBEC AND NEW YORK.

Then take the route from Quebec and compare it with the route from New York.

	Miles.
From New York to Plymouth,	1,200
From Quebec to Plymouth,	2,020
—	370

So that you have a gain from Quebec of 370 miles besides a gain on the Pacific ocean of 720 miles, showing that the route by Quebec and Port Simpson is 1,090 miles shorter than by San Francisco and New York. These are the sea routes.

THE LAND ROUTES.

If we can shorten the land routes 200 or 300 miles, then we have the 1,423 miles, which Sir Sandford Fleming says, is the true advantage, Canada has, in her trade routes, over the trade routes of the United States. If we have that advantage, the United States cannot contend successfully against that enormous distance of 1,423 miles, provided we exploit our advantages; but heretofore the United States have found our country of little enterprise, and no matter what their disadvantages were, they had no competition and therefore prevailed.

JAPAN CURRENT.

The Japan current, also, is fighting for Canada. All the currents of the ocean seem to be fighting for this northern country. The Japan current takes the ships and lands them almost opposite Port Simpson. A ship for San Francisco has to go north of Port Simpson, to get out of the Japan current. All the currents of the ocean, give Canada an immense superiority, over the other trade routes on this continent.

THIS RAILWAY SHOULD BE OPPOSED.

The reason, I oppose this railway, is

that on leaving Port Simpson, you have unnecessarily dragged it out of its natural course, 600 miles from the north, down south around Lake Winnipeg, and then seek to take it north-east back to Moncton. You give this railway a long circuitous route, when there is a straight line from Port Simpson to the Saguenay, which will give you a route three hundred miles shorter. That fatal defect, prevents your line from being a national one, and makes it a provincial line, marred by political and local considerations of every character. The reason it was located around the south end of Lake Winnipeg, is because the votes are there, but when we are asked to spend \$100,000,000 to \$200,000,000, we should leave these local considerations out of view, and make a great national line. If these people want additional local railways, let them say so, and I will vote to give them those railways. I voted this session for the Mann & Mackenzie scheme, and am prepared to vote for half a dozen other provincial railways, but I will not vote, to mar a great national highway, by making it take, this circuitous route.

THE TRANS-CANADA

I oppose this scheme because it is fatally marred, by its location. I will proceed to show what the Trans-Canada scheme would perform.

	Miles.
From Port Simpson to Quebec via Trans-Canada	2,927
From Port Simpson to Chicoutimi via Trans-Canada	2,705

Difference in favor of Chicoutimi. 222

By taking this line down to Chicoutimi, you would save 222 miles, even over Quebec.

	Miles.
From Halifax to Vancouver via the C. P. R.	3,753
From Halifax to Port Simpson via Quebec and the Trans-Canada.	3,505

Difference in favor of the Trans-Canada via Quebec 248

Consequently the whole saving of distance by the Trans-Canada, if it went to Chicoutimi, would be 340 miles. That, added to the enormous advantage, we have by the sea, absolutely gives the control to Canada. We have 1,280 miles by sea of an advantage, and 340 by land, which gives a saving over the distance of 1,423 miles, which Sir Sandford Fleming says is our advantage of 107 miles.

I cannot support a line, at this time in our history, which does not give us a national highway, in every sense of the term. Let us go from Yokohama to Port Simpson and Plymouth by the Trans-Canada. I want to compare the Trans-Canada, with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the lines through the United States. Even the Canadian Pacific Railway would be at an enormous disadvantage, compared with the Trans-Canada.

VIA THE TRANS-CANADA

	Miles
From Yokohama to Port Simpson	3,810
From Port Simpson to Halifax via the Trans-Canada	3,505
From Halifax to Plymouth	2,430

Yokohama to Plymouth 9,745
That would make a total of 9,745 miles from Yokohama to Plymouth via the Trans-Canada, compared with 10,423 miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway, namely

	Miles
From Yokohama to Vancouver.	4,240
From Vancouver to Halifax	3,753
From Halifax to Plymouth	2,430

10,423

making a saving in favour of the Trans-Canada route of 678 miles over the C. P. R.

These are some of the reasons which have induced me, reluctantly to oppose this resolution. I thought at one time, until I examined it thoroughly, that I would have to ask my political friends to excuse me on this division. I am in favour of railways, and the development of Canada, and in our party we have individual opinions and are not supposed to be slaves. I thought, that if this scheme of the government, provided a practicable solution of the transportation question, that I would have to ask my friends to excuse me, if I voted for it, because the question was a national and not a political one. But upon examination of the question, I am bound to say, that this railway is not designed to forward national, but party ideals.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend explain about the opposition's proposal?

Mr. GURLEY. As I am dealing with yours, just now, you will excuse me, if I continue. When I have finished with your proposal, I shall be happy to deal with the other. You should not manifest this hurry. No doubt, you think, because I am demolishing your proposition so successfully, I can do better, than you have done, and insist that I do the opposition. Now, gentlemen.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Address the Chair.

Miles.
 er. 4,240
 ... 3,753
 ... 2,430

10,423
 of the
 les over

s which
 oppose
 the time,
 that I
 friends
 I am in
 develop-
 erty we
 are not
 ht, that
 nt, pro-
 of the
 would
 use me,
 uestion
 al one,
 uestion,
 way is
 al, but

hon
 tion's

earing
 excuse
 e fin
 all be
 You
 No
 emol
 billy,
 done,
 tion,

Ad-

Mr. GOURLEY. I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, these hon. gentlemen, seeing that I am a young hand, at addressing the House, are trying to put me out. Now, I have compared the Trans-Canada route with the Canadian Pacific, and I find a difference of 678 miles in favour of the Trans-Canada.

UNITED STATES ROUTES.

Let me compare it with some of the American routes.

Sea Miles.

From Yokohama to San Francisco	4,530
From San Francisco to New York via Chicago, the shortest commercial route	3,349
From New York to Plymouth	2,990
<hr/>	
	10,869

Here is a total of 10,869 miles from Yokohama to Plymouth, through the United States by way of San Francisco and New York. The Trans-Canada has a distance of 9,745 miles, or a difference in favour of the Trans-Canada of 1,124 miles. That gives us dominance and absolute control of the trade of the Orient. The Americans know, that we have the advantage. I have friends on the Pacific coast, who tell me: "You Canadians have the advantage; why don't you use it?" In San Francisco and Seattle, they know the advantage of our position, but they trust to the general sleepiness of Canada, to save them. I am endeavouring, to wake up the people of Canada, and to wake up the hon. gentlemen opposite. It is not too late yet. Let no pride of opinion, stand in the way, of great national interests. When the leader, of the hon. gentlemen opposite, submitted this scheme I must say he appealed to my national sentiments,

and I congratulate him on the way he put his scheme. If he, had had, the real article to deliver to us, I would have said, he was a great statesman and knew the interests and needs of Canada. But when I examined this scheme and found it a gold brick, I said to myself:—when we appeal to these gentlemen opposite, they will go to their leaders, and will ask them to take time, to mature this scheme more carefully. Let them get Cox to wait.

THE GRIT TRINITY.

A gentleman the other day said to me: "Do you know that the Grits have a new God to worship, a new Trinity?" I replied "I did not. What is it?" "Time, Tide and Cox," was the answer. I think the hon. gentleman from Pontiac (Mr. Murray) who looks like a late distinguished divine in Truro, if he were the man he resembles, might define that Trinity, and tell us how to climax it, tell us whether it should be Time, Tide and Cox; Cox, Time and Tide or what? Perhaps he would make a sandwich of it, with Time, and Tide inside, and Cox on the top and bottom. It looks to be as hard to get Cox to wait, as to get the Time and Tide to wait. But he must be a cruel God if he will not listen to the pleadings of his devotees, and wait for a little time. Why, even the Pagan God Juggernaut waited on one occasion. And there is this similarity between the Pagan God and Cox, that Juggernaut rides in a car and so does Cox. When you follow out this ecclesiastical idea, there is infinite variety and amusement in it. We should never have understood the idea of the Trinity, had it not been for the work of a strong mind like St. Athanasius, who gave us a clear idea of Trinity in Unity and Unity in Trinity. The God of the hon. gentlemen oppo-

site seems to be a Trinity—Cox in unity and unity in Cox, and being of one substance with Cox. But the resemblance is perhaps closer to the Pagan God Juggernaut. He is a cruel God and rides in his car, over his prostrate devotees, and destroys them. So does Cox. And Cox will put these hon. gentlemen, in such a position, that the people will grind them up. Now, all we ask is that hon. gentlemen opposite, should get this cruel Cox of theirs, to wait. They have not gone too far; let them get him to wait, until the best information with regard to this scheme, can be collected. And if this is done, I feel confident, the Trans-Canada route, will be adopted. Some hon. gentlemen, stood with me in the advocacy of the Trans-Canada route, and I am going to watch these gentlemen in this debate. I have heard, that a number were solicitous, about the way I would vote. I happened to have expressed my mind on this question six months ago. I was in Quebec, and through Nova Scotia, and told the people, that I objected to the present transcontinental lines, because they were unnecessarily long, and would not give Canada, the place she should occupy in relation to the transcontinental business, and we must do better. I favoured the trans-Canada route, then, and I stand to it still. But, hon. gentlemen, who were with me then, I find, in some mysterious manner, have been converted to this scheme of hon. gentlemen opposite.

THE GRAND TRUNK.

Six months ago in Quebec, I said that the Grand Trunk, should not be allowed to interfere in this transcontinental system; because by their interests in the United States, they were anchored in an attitude, hostile, to the

great transcontinental routes of Canada. I have only one voice for Quebec for this House and for all Canada.

I will now show, that, in addition to the enormous advantages that are to be gained from the shortness of the route, the pass leading to Port Simpson is the best pass on the continent.

THE PEACE RIVER PASS.

Nature herself, in throwing down those rocks, and levelling that mighty Rocky Mountain Range, indicates, that she intended, that the trade of the Orient should cross that spot. The Peace River pass, through which the line goes to Port Simpson, is only 2,000 feet high. The next pass to the south is the Pine river pass, which is 2,600 feet high. The Trans-Canada proposed to take the Peace river pass. See what the Canadian Pacific Railway has to climb—5,288 feet. Imagine the enormous difficulty to a railway of climbing that height, as compared to one only 2,000 feet. That is the determining factor, in a transcontinental railway for carrying the freight of the East. The Great Northern has to climb 5,202 feet and the Northern Pacific 5,550 feet. Another railway, the Union Pacific, has to climb 8,247 feet, and then there is a railway, the Denver and Rio Grande that climbs 10,433 feet. The trend of the mountains, in Canada, points to the domination of Canada, and to the domination of the trade routes by Canada. At the Peace river pass for the first time, you get an elevation of only 2,000 feet, and as the Rocky mountains go south down to Rio Grande, they rise to over 10,000 feet. Consequently, every railway in the United States, is absolutely handicapped, in comparison with the railways of Canada.

ON ALL THE GROUNDS.

On all grounds, on the ground of the passes, on the ground of the shortness of the route across the ocean, on the ground of the shortness of the route across the continent, the advantage is in favour of Canada, if this government will adopt, a truly national line. I would commend these views to the study of the people of British Columbia. I must compliment the hon. gentleman from Burrard (Mr. Macpherson), who spoke on this question the other day. He evidently has been studying this problem, and knows something about the trade of the Orient, and sees the splendid outlook in that direction. I advise hon. gentlemen, from British Columbia to study this question, and when we come to understand our true position geographically, and the advantages we have, we will not for one hour put up with a railway, that does not follow the true lines of national policy, in this country. You can debate, this policy of the government, as much as you like, and the more it is discussed, as far as I see it, the more objectionable, the more absolutely opposed, to the great interests of Canada, does it become. The Prime Minister puts this railway on national grounds. If he had put it on provincial grounds, and said: I am building, a great ocean to ocean, vote-catcher; I intend to spend \$200,000,000 to create a great ocean to ocean vote-catcher; I want votes, from end to end of this Dominion, and believe this will get them—if he had based it on that ground, I would have said that that was a bold policy and it would have given a splendid opportunity for attack; but when he clothes this project, with the mantle, of the national policy of Canada, I say that is a great wrong, unless he is able to pro-

duce the article, and show in the clearest manner, that this line will advance, in the highest sense, the true interests of Canada.

A HAPHAZARD ROUTE.

The route indicated here, is a haphazard route. It goes along almost the top of the height of land, between Hudson's Bay and Lake Superior. The great slope of that plateau is towards the Hudson's Bay; it is a great alluvial slope, which becomes richer as it gets nearer to Hudson's Bay, as a matter of course, because the alluvial soil is carried down. But the government line does not go near that rich soil. This line should be about 200 miles north of Lake Nepigon, but instead of that, it hugs it, just at the point where the land is the least fertile. The government, have taken the worst route on this continent, for the building of a railway, intended to develop an agricultural or timber country. If the line had been placed, on the gentle slopes of those magnificent rivers flowing into the Hudson's Bay, it would have been very much better. The hon. member, for North Norfolk, thought that people did not know anything about the Nottaway river. In Nova Scotia, the little girls in the kindergartens, will tell the hon. gentlemen about these rivers, and I am inclined to think that the hon. member for North Norfolk should come down to Truro and take a kindergarten course, because he would then know something of the geography of Canada. If a line is to be built to develop the agricultural resources of this country, it should be built, as I have said, 200 miles north of Lake Nepigon.

THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

May I quote for one moment from the "Fortnightly Review," for March last. I may say, that no man can gain access to the columns of the "Fortnightly Review," unless he is accurate, and an authority upon his subject; you will find the writings, of none, but the most capable men there, and I would ask every hon. member to read this article, which is the most accomplished exposition of the trade routes of Canada, that I have seen. The writer says:

"The Trans-Canada Railway will be one of the grandest inter-oceanic lines on the continent. It will take an almost direct course from Quebec to the northern end of Lake Winnipeg, passing about 100 miles to the south of James bay, with which it will have a branch connection. From Lake Winnipeg, still following a very direct route, it will cross a low depression in the Rocky Mountain range, at the Pine river or Peace river pass, and reach the Pacific coast of British Columbia at Port Simpson. Its length will be about 2,830 miles, or from 250 to 550 miles less distance between the two oceans than the other Pacific railways. Nature seems to have done everything possible to facilitate the construction of such a line: very easy gradients and curves of great radius are its characteristic features, and it will cross the mountains at an elevation above sea-level one-half that of any other Pacific railway north of Mexico. Its eastern termini, Quebec on the St. Lawrence, and Chicoutimi on the Saguenay, are accessible to ships of any draught, while Port Simpson, open the entire year, is admirably adapted to be the terminus of such a trade route, and is 450 miles nearer than Vancouver is to Yokohama."

I cannot understand why the Prime Minister, when he had the most abundant evidence of the splendid character of the line like this, should contract with the Grand Trunk to build this greatly inferior line. The hon. Prime Minister when he introduced his scheme, valued the connection of the Grand Trunk with it. In Nova Scotia, and the maritime provinces the Grand Trunk is regarded, as the evil genius of the scheme. We in the maritime provinces, want to have nothing to do with the Grand Trunk. The Grand Trunk's sole purpose is to get into the wheat fields of the west in order to hitch a portion of the grain trade to its system in eastern Canada and to haul it to Portland; and the Prime Minister was not strong enough to resist its influence, because the Grand Trunk Railway, I presume had numerous votes all over the country, to deliver to the government.

CHIEF ENGINEER OF TRANS-CANADA.

I shall read, now, from a report of Mr. A. E. Doucet, chief engineer of the Trans-Canada Railway, whom I had the pleasure of meeting last fall, and who struck me as a student and a scholar. He says:

"Mr. C. E. Perry, M.L.C.E., has arrived in Quebec, bringing with him plans and profiles of two hundred miles of line, and he has laid out enough work for the assistants to keep them busy until his return at the end of May. The line located, so far, is absolutely right, with the exception of two miles of 1 degree each, and the average about four feet to the mile."

The hon. member for North Norfolk

was talking the other day about twenty-foot grades, about grades of four-tenths of one per cent. Here we have a grade of four feet to the mile and a line almost straight. What comparison is there between such a line of railway, and the line proposed by the government?

Mr. Doucet further says:

"A most favourable bridge site has been located across the Nelson river

He is speaking now of the country north of Lake Winnipeg, which has been denounced by some gentlemen—and we have an unfortunate and absurd habit in this country of declaring that any part of the country which we do not know personally is of no value—and this gentleman tells us that this country is a good country fit for settlement, immediately, upon the construction of a railway.

"A most favourable bridge site has been located across the Nelson river, the outlet of Lake Winnipeg, and advantage has been taken of Warren's Island to reduce the length of the bridge.

"Mr. Perry reports that, contrary to the general impression, he found good agricultural land to the east and west of the north end of Lake Winnipeg, also plenty of spruce and tamarack, with numerous waterfalls adjacent, for the generation of power. The fisheries of the lake are very important, and gold-bearing quartz and numerous veins of iron ore have been found in the vicinity. The snowfall in this region was so light that Mr. Perry and his parties were able to work without snowshoes, and but one day was lost due to unfavour-

able weather. The work upon this part of the line will be as light as prairie work. To the east of Nelson river crossing, it was found possible to secure a tangent of one hundred miles, an engineering feature without precedent; and to the west of the crossing we have one tangent of forty miles. Terminal facilities have been secured at the north end of the lake, which will enable us to tap navigation on Winnipeg lake, and afford us an easy means of communication with Winnipeg."

There is a line which possesses 4-foot grades, and which has a tangent of 100 miles. We have a very fertile country there and under these circum-

What is the use of the Prime Minister putting up the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to labour with a grade of 21 feet to the mile, on the route proposed by the government, when this line offers the advantages, not only of a local line, to open up this country, but also of a through line of national importance? The chief engineer says:

"It will be at once apparent that no difficulties of a serious nature, from a topographical point of view, exist on the location chosen for the main line of the Trans-Canada Railway, and that with branch lines judiciously laid out at various points, a great portion of the northern part of the Dominion will be tapped and developed, and the riches of its soil and forests be brought within easy reach of the large population which it is confidently expected the construction of the Trans-Canada Railway will cause to flow into this rich heritage of the Canadian people."

"From this report it will be seen

that the country through which the Trans-Canada Railway will be located, is sufficiently well known to state definitely :

1. That no obstacles of a serious nature, as regards construction, exist throughout the whole route.
2. That the amount of rock work is inconsiderable.
3. That the gradients will be easy as the country is so level.
4. That the soil, composed mostly of clay or of clay formation, is fit for agriculture for the greater part of the distance.
5. That there are valuable areas of timber lands on the route.
6. That the lands and the timber will assure to the railway an immediate return in produce, lumber and minerals."

I think the House, at the present time, would say, that it would be of enormous advantage, to have that country opened up, even apart, from this being the line of shortest transportation.

SIR SANDFORD FLEMING.

But, further, let me read from a statement by Sir Sandford Fleming on the 4th of October, 1902, whose attention was called to this proposed route. He says :

"A new national railway, should, in my judgment, begin at the Quebec bridge, now building, where it would form a direct connection with the Intercolonial and it should extend from Quebec by the most direct route to Port Simpson on the Pacific. From what I know of the general character

of the greater part of the intervening distance, I believe a line with splendid engineering features could, with ordinary care be secured. It would pass away to the North of the rugged shores of Lakes Huron, Superior, Nepigon, and Winnipeg, through a vast region reported generally of alluvial soil, with abundance of wood and water."

He says further :

"I have already expressed my doubts as to the wisdom or expediency of proceeding in a haphazard way to establish a new transcontinental railway. I regard the shortest line obtainable between the tide-waters of the two oceans as quite long enough. For that reason and other cogent reasons I would advocate the most favourable route which can be had between the port of Quebec and Port Simpson for a new Dominion Grand Trunk line, and at the same time to have in view the establishment of railway service with all desirable points by branches judiciously laid out.

"When the day arrives to open the railway as a through route it will be found to possess advantages, in respect to distances, as compared with the route via San Francisco and New York. From Yokohama to Liverpool the passage across the Pacific Ocean would be 605 and across the Atlantic 195 nautical miles less. While the land distance would be 502 statute miles less, making a total saving on the whole distance of about 1,423 statute miles. Regarded simply from a Canadian standpoint, I cannot conceive any public undertaking which would better meet the wants of the new Dominion, throughout its whole

extent. I rejoice to know that it has so soon in Canadian history been brought up for serious consideration."

At that time, Sir Sandford Fleming, believed, that the government and the people were prepared to adopt the shortest route. He did not assume, that the route would be deflected, and that the Trans-Canada railway would be carried away down south of Lake Winnipeg, which disfigures the whole scheme, from a national standpoint.

SIR WILLIAM VAN HORNE.

Sir William Van Horne, who spoke of this railway, says in an interview on November 8th, 1902 :

"The position of the Canadian Pacific Railway is absolutely unassailable. For that reason, it is our policy never to oppose anything. The Trans-Canada road has started with better prospects than the Canadian Pacific had once. When the Northern Pacific road was built, everybody thought it was way up North beyond nowhere. Then the Great Northern was built, and people promptly forgot thinking of the Northern Pacific, as far north. Then came the Canadian Pacific, and that seemed to run through the Arctic regions. We would hail with delight a parallel route from the Atlantic to the Pacific to help us develop the country. There is enough of it up there for us all."

He says that the Trans-Canada railway, will not interfere, in any way, with the Canadian Pacific Railway and that it has an excellent chance of being a financial success. If I can show, that this Trans-Canada railway, not

only develops Canada in the highest degree, but that it has a reasonable chance of financial success, then I am bound to reject the scheme proposed by the government, because we cannot be justified in assuming that it would ever pay, in a financial sense, within a reasonable number of years. I have heard some hon. gentleman attack the bargain made with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Do these hon. gentlemen imagine that the people of Canada are not students? We have here a bargain which is at least ten times worse than the bargain made some twenty-two years ago with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I would not care, very much, whether this was a successful bargain from the standpoint of the cash return it brings or not, if it would answer the national purpose; because, I believe, that if we could get the trade of the East, for five or ten years, it would sweep away, a dozen national debts like that of Canada. The trade of the Orient would enrich the cities, bring prosperity to the people, create a larger national life and build up great Canadian ports like New York on the Pacific and Atlantic oceans.

COLONEL EARL CHURCH.

Colonel Earl Church, in the 'Fortnightly Review' for March, 1903, says:

"A railway traversing the heart of the Dominion of Canada would not only harmonize and give stability to all its varied forms of industry and commercial movement, but confer upon it strategic advantages of a high order. It would also be the natural British answer to the Trans-Siberia Railway; but, apart from the military aspect of such a line, its advantages as a through trade route between

Europe and the Orient, due to its technical features and deep-water termini, are matchless. It should be possible to ship goods over it, between England and Japan and China, cheaper and much quicker than by any other route, even that via Suez.

That is the judgment, of an expert, who says, that this route, would give Canada a greater advantage than that afforded by the Suez canal. The only dispute about the trade would be as to how much we were to get. If the Suez canal, does not carry the whole trade, it will come over Canada; therefore, we would be possessed of a trade, which has made all nations, from Babylon down, the dominant powers, while they possessed that trade. I am glad that the hon. gentleman from British Columbia, is listening to this picture, of the future grandeur of his province. If this line were thrown north of Lake Winnipeg, a branch to Winnipeg would relieve the congestion, much more rapidly than the building of a railway in the direction now proposed. It is proposed, to put the headquarters of this line, at Winnipeg, and then to go North to the Peace River country, 600 miles away, to bring the wheat to Winnipeg.

THE CONGESTION.

It is said that this will relieve the congestion; but it would be much more sensible to go north of Lake Winnipeg, and take the wheat directly east to Canadian ports for shipment. I understand, that the Canadian Northern Railway, and the Canadian Pacific Railway, with the additions that are being made to them, are in a position to cope with the trade of Manitoba, provided the wheat from the northern country, is shipped by railway to the

Saguenay, and not brought down to further congest Winnipeg. I hold my mind, perfectly open, with reference to grain transportation by rail, for within 16 years, I have seen the freight rates on railways, cut one-half. I am prepared for further reductions in the future, and with reference to the Trans-Canada, I am bound to say, that had they got their subsidy, they would have solved the transportation difficulty, and the freight rate question. In their petition to the government, these able men, who were promoting the Trans-Canada Railway, offered to carry wheat from any point on their line in the Province of Manitoba, to the point of ocean shipment at Chicoutimi, for nine cents a bushel, which is seven cents less than the present ocean rate to the sea-board. This offer was made, by competent men, who are engaged in the transportation business, and they must have had some idea of what they were doing, when they offered this nine cent rate.

BAD FINANCIAL SCHEME.

Let me ask, if the proposition of the government, is the best, that could be made from a financial point of view? When the Canadian Northern Railway came here, for a guarantee of their bonds, I thought that was a very proper way of assisting a national highway, because I fancied that the time had come, when railway promoters, could find portions of this country where a railway would pay, even if built with the money of its promoters, without the assistance of the government. And so, when the Canadian Northern Railway asked for a guarantee, I thought that a new era of railway construction in Canada had arrived. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, boasted then that they

could get a better bargain than the Conservative government had obtained. The Trans-Canada people, were convinced, that the time had arrived, when very little assistance, need be given by a Canadian government, to a transcontinental railway. I am informed, by credible authority, that the capitalists from New York and London, who were at the back of the Trans-Canada line, were at the time, when they made the proposition, to the government, of the Dominion of Canada, that the Dominion government, should assume the construction and the operation of the railway, and all its financial responsibilities assumed by the government, is something I cannot understand. In the petition, presented to the government, by the promoters of the Trans-Canada railway, the following statement is made:

"The great financial success achieved by the Canadian Pacific Railway has rendered it much easier to secure capital for such an undertaking as this than it was twenty years ago, and the project should not have the antagonism of the capital interested in the Canadian Pacific Railway, as it must be beneficial to that road by putting population into the section of the country between the two lines."

I think that memorial, was the origin of the letter of Sir William Van Horne, who said that he had no objection to the Trans-Canada line. Further on the petition says:

"If the Dominion government, will grant to us a subsidy of \$6,400 per mile, it is believed that a financial basis would be established, which would secure the necessary capital

to carry out this most important undertaking, which will make Canada a solid country with great agricultural resources, instead of a fringe of settlements, subject as it is now, to the good will from day to day of our powerful neighbours to the South."

TRANS-CANADA SUBSIDY.

Here is an offer from the Trans-Canada railway, to build this line for \$6,400 per mile, and to give to a land grant from the Dominion government, 2,000 acres per mile, through Dominion lands, to the same extent as promised by the provincial government, namely 2,000 acres per mile. For this the Trans-Canada offered advantages, which never were offered, before by any other railway company. They offered to construct the entire road, with steel rails and steel bridges, all manufactured in Canada, and contrast that with the proposition made by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, as to the use of Canadian manufactures and goods, on that railway. Then the Trans-Canada offered further:

"To give free transportation, from Quebec to any point on its line, for all immigrants and bona fide settlers and their effects, and to carry wheat from all points on their line in the province of Manitoba to the ocean steamer at Chicoutimi or Quebec, for 9 cents per bushel or for 7 cents less per bushel than present freight rates"

The Trans-Canada was estimated at 2,735 miles from Chicoutimi to Port Simpson, and at \$6,400 per mile, the subsidy would be \$17,312,000. Then there would be the branch to Quebec of 126 miles and at the same subsidy it would cost us \$808,000. The Trans-Canada only asked \$18,120,000 of a

subsidy, to build and equip their line. Why was that proposition turned down, for such an atrocious financial scheme, as the government now submits to us? Then if the Trans-Canada were extended to Moncton it would be 381 miles longer, and that at \$6,400 per mile would amount to \$2,438,000, so that the entire cash subsidy they required from Moncton to Port Simpson would be \$20,558,000.

A LAND GRANT.

Then, of course, they wanted a land subsidy, as far as the government of Canada owned the land. This railway was to go largely through the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, and probably there would not be more than 1,000 miles of Dominion lands, through which this road would go. Suppose it got a subsidy of 20,000 acres a mile, that would be 20,000,000 acres. Well, I will undertake to say, that the giving of land to the Trans-Canada Railway, on that unsettled route, would be one of the best investments, Canada could make. I do not believe, now, in giving land for railroads, in the old settled parts of Manitoba and the North-west; but in the case of the Trans-Canada, which was intended to open up, an entirely new country, I believe it would be in the highest interests of Canada, to give 25,000,000 acres of land, to that company, for the purpose of enabling them to build the line, and thus inaugurate settlement; because they would do exactly what the Canadian Pacific Railway did—organize themselves, into a great immigration agency, scour Europe and bring millions of people into this country. Then we would have had every alternate block of land for sale, warranted to recoup us, every

dollar, we gave the company. When I heard these propositions, in reference to the building of a great transcontinental line by the Grand Trunk Pacific, I thought we were to have a proposition of the nature of the Trans-Canada Railway. I thought the time had come, when we should get a Trans-Canada Railway, built for \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000; and I would rather give that company that sum of money outright, with an assurance that the railway would be built, than to enter into all these guarantees, which are involved in the scheme of the government. Consequently, I think the government should have accepted that policy, not only in the interest of the proper location of a transcontinental line, but also in the interest of the finances of Canada.

Now I have dealt with your proposition from a national standpoint. I find it fatally bad from a national point of view, bad financially, and bad on the ground that the railway is located south of Lake Winnipeg.

THE MARITIME PROVINCES ARE OPPOSED TO IT.

I desire, now, to show you, that the whole maritime provinces, have debated this subject, and have instructed me to oppose this railway, on the ground that it has been located south of Lake Winnipeg. We in Nova Scotia, know the geography of this country, and we have come to the conclusion, that any line, that brings its traffic down to Winnipeg, places it in such imminent danger of being captured by the United States transportation companies on the Great Lakes, that we do not expect, to see, one pound of it reach the maritime provinces.

RAILWAY MEETINGS IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Therefore last summer, when the railway meetings were called in Nova Scotia, and this discussion arose, we all settled on that policy. My hon. friend from Chicoutimi (Mr. Girard) came down to Nova Scotia, we were delighted to see and hear him, and he heard the people of Nova Scotia, declaring for a line, north of Lake Winnipeg; and therefore I expect him to support us, in our hour of trial. I want all the other gentlemen, who attended those meetings in Nova Scotia, also to stand up, and vote with me on this question; I shall be shocked, if they do not do so.

I will state briefly the objections which we have to this route as follows:—that it does not follow the shortest route; that it unduly lengthens the route; that it runs counter to the physical and geographical features of Canada; that it carries wheat and other products from points between 400 and 600 miles north of the boundary down to Winnipeg, or 45 miles from the American territory. From this point it is in danger from Minneapolis, the American fleet on the lakes, from New York and Buffalo, and if it reaches Montreal, then, from Boston and Portland. So we believe, we have no chance in Nova Scotia while the trade is carried south of Lake Winnipeg. That is the fatal mistake, of the Grand Trunk Pacific, so far as the maritime provinces are concerned.

STRANGERS AND OUR TRADE ROUTES.

Strangers are studying our trade routes, and they see the danger of the Lake Routes. The "Fortnightly Review" says:

"In the embarking of Canadian products at the head of Lake Superior, for water transportation, the shipper at once enters into competition with the powerful commercial expansion of the United States on the great lakes, and he stands but a ridiculous chance in the rivalry. If the Canadian Pacific Railway is able to divert a certain quantity of wheat from this route, overland to Montreal, again it largely drifts into the United States, thus showing how thoroughly the latter controls the position from whatever point it is analysed"

So outsiders seem to know our difficulties, and yet the Prime Minister and the government of this country, do not really understand the great trade routes of this country, and the necessity of preserving the maritime provinces from the fatal mistake of route made by this railway. The Minister of Finance read a resolution from *l'Espresso* the other day. I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not state correctly the facts. That resolution had reference to a railway mooted thirteen or fourteen years ago; when we did not understand the trade routes, and when we were glad to get any kind of a railway down there. That resolution was adopted then; but it is different to-day. Almost every board of trade of Nova Scotia has passed a resolution condemning the route of this railroad.

HALIFAX BOARD OF TRADE.

Read the resolution, passed by the Board of Trade of Halifax, on the 3rd of November, 1902, and see how clearly, they understand this question:

"Whereas the transportation facilities of any country are a most im-

portant factor in the development of its industries and commerce, and whereas the Halifax Board of Trade is of the opinion that the time has arrived when another Canadian trans-continental railway should be constructed, and whereas a line from **Quebec north of Lake Winnipeg to Port Simpson**, would open up an immense area of fertile lands in the North-West province, the shortest route from the Atlantic to the Pacific entirely on Canadian territory, and serve the best interests of the empire from a military standpoint, and whereas the route proposed by the Trans-Canada Railway Company between Quebec and Port Simpson, should serve the interests of the maritime provinces, better than any other established or projected route, therefore resolved, that the federal government be asked to aid in the construction of such a line, enforcing stringent conditions that will ensure the entire traffic through Canadian ports both summer and winter."

That is the declaration of the Board of Trade of Halifax, a declaration which gentlemen representing the business interests, not only of Halifax, but of Nova Scotia, should stand by and support.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Does he pretend to be the mouthpiece of the public opinion of the province of Nova Scotia?

Mr. GOURLEY. No, but I am one-eighteen of it. I am willing to make a fair division of it with the hon. gentleman; but I am reading now the opinion of the business men of Halifax, as expressed through their City Council, their Board of Trade, and their public officers, who assembled and dis-

cussed this question. They command me, as they command the hon. gentleman, and I will obey them. I hope the hon. gentleman, will also obey their voice. If he does not, he will suffer when he goes before the electors. Let him come with me, and not obey the voice of a government, that has done wrong. Let him come with me, and let us vote together in the interests of the maritime provinces.

A GREAT ENTREPOT.

The publication of Nova Scotia, the Hon. Joseph Howe and Sir Charles Tupper, induced us to enter Confederation, by predicting that Halifax was to be a great Entrepot, the wharf of North America. Well, we have been waiting for a long time, for the fulfilment of that prediction. When the Intercolonial Railway, was built, we thought the day had come, when Halifax would be the wharf of Canada. When the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, we thought it was coming, and when the canals were deepened we thought it was sure to come, but we were continually doomed to disappointment. We found that the whole trade of the country, was being taken south, for the benefit of the people of Ontario and Montreal, and while that state of things continued, we knew that we would never see the trade, which had been promised us. Therefore, we in the maritime provinces, desire that a railway should be built, north of Lake Winnipeg, to connect with the maritime provinces; because until that is done, it will be idle for us to look, for any of these great benefits, which were promised us on joining Confederation.

THE ST. JOHN BOARD OF TRADE.

On the 19th day of February last the

St. John Board of Trade, discussed the whole question. Let me read you the resolutions of the Board of Trade of St. John, to show how thoroughly the business men there understand the whole situation :

"That the St. John Board of Trade, having already expressed the opinion that the next transcontinental railway to be built in Canada, should be an extension by the government of the Intercolonial Railway——"

Where is the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), who was so anxious for some argument, in support of the policy of the leader of the opposition ? He will find it in this resolution of the board of trade of the largest city of his province. They believe that the extension of the Intercolonial Railway, is the proper policy, and that is the policy of the leader of the opposition :

"—from Montreal to the Pacific coast and having since heard the views of the promoters of the Trans-Canada Railway Company and the opinion of Sir Sandford Fleming approving of the construction of the transcontinental line by government, but favouring such extension being built by the most direct line from the new bridge at Quebec to Port Simpson as being the shortest line from ocean to ocean, hereby re-affirms the resolutions already passed by the board and is of opinion that the inability of the present railway system to move the enormous and rapidly increasing crops of the North-West, and the rapid influx of new settlers into this country will amply justify the government at no very distant period in building the proposed railway as a public work.

"But the board is further of opinion that in the event of parliament being unwilling to undertake the construction of such extension from Montreal to the Pacific coast, as a public work of the Dominion, the more northerly line now proposed from Quebec to Port Simpson offers better advantages to the country than any of the other suggested lines.

"And further that the proposals for any transcontinental line should contain distinct provisions for the extension of such line through the maritime provinces to the winter seaports in those provinces and that rigid guarantees should be exacted that only Canadian seaports should be used both in winter and summer time."

That covers the whole ground. I was sorry the Minister of Finance, was not in his place when I read the resolution of the St. John Board of Trade, which is a recent resolution. I propose to read another recent one, from Truro, a little later in my address, and I shall do so because the hon. gentleman read a very old one of thirteen or fourteen years ago, when we had altogether different notions about the transportation routes.

NORTH SYDNEY

I have under my hand the resolutions of the Board of Trade of North Sydney, passed on the 5th of May :—

"That the principle of federal subsidies, to railway lines, can only be justified, on a national system, that would cheapen transportation, and facilitate ocean transit, through Canadian ports only.

"That for a short transcontinental line, the short track and easy grades between Quebec and Port Simpson,

B.C., as indicated in the plans of the Trans-Canada Company, should recommend the route to the favourable consideration of the government and parliament.

"For these reasons, this board, is of the opinion that if the government favour the building of another transcontinental railway, the line projected by the Trans-Canada Railway Company would best serve the interests of the Dominion, as in addition to its favourable conditions, its location would involve the sole use of Canadian terminal ports.

"And further, in the interests of the whole country, provision should be made for the extension of the short line through the maritime provinces, to a first-class port on the eastern sea-board of Canada."

I condemn the government, for attempting to grapple with a great transcontinental line, and then stopping at Moncton. That is one of the fatal defects of this scheme.

THE QUEBEC BOARD OF TRADE.

I find that the board of trade, of the city of Quebec, dealt with this matter very intelligently. They said :

"That for these reasons, and in view of the paramount national importance of this question, the Quebec Board of Trade would earnestly recommend the government before selecting any route to submit the question to a commission of eminent engineers, so that the best line may be selected.

"That this board is of opinion that no charter should be granted by par-

liament for any additional transcontinental lines, or for any railways to carry the produce of the interior to the sea-board, without the most careful consideration, and that in any transcontinental charter hereafter granted, the following condition should be rigorously exacted :—

"1. That such new line should be the shortest possible from ocean to ocean, and should run by the most level route obtainable so as to ensure favourable grades and enable the western farmer to obtain lower freight rates on grain.

"2. That the location selected and the conditions to be imposed by parliament should be such as to compel the shipment of the goods exported seaward by such railway to be by St. Lawrence ports in summer and maritime province ports in winter."

Here is a great board of trade, composed of the most prominent business men, who say that the proposition now before us, does not meet with their approval, and they give their reasons :

"That in the opinion of this board the new line proposed to be built by the Grand Trunk does not meet any of these requirements, for the following reasons :—

"1. Because the distance by Grand Trunk from Portland to Port Simpson via North Bay will be about 3,600 miles, and from Lévis to Port Simpson about 3,400 miles. Whereas the distance from Quebec to Vancouver by the Canadian Pacific is only 3,078 miles, and a direct line from the City of Quebec, through northern Quebec and northern Ontario by the route granted by parliament last year by charter to the

Trans-Canada Railway would only be about 2,830 miles, and the distance from Montreal to the same point, by the branch line provided for in the Trans-Canada charter, less than 2,900 miles."

They go a long way to show, that you have adopted, one of the longest routes. They further say :

"3. That the direction of the proposed Grand Trunk line running south-easterly from the north end of Lake Winnipeg towards Toronto, to such an extent that its easterly end will be ten degrees or 600 miles further south than the prairie district which it is sought to develop, invites the very danger of diversion of trade to the United States, which parliament has always sought to avoid in such charters."

Here is your whole scheme condemned by these business men.

TRURO BOARD OF TRADE AND CITIZENS.

I will now show you what the town of Truro says, the Athens of Nova Scotia, where we have the schools, from which we control, the whole public opinion of the provinces. A resolution was passed at the meeting at Truro on the 30th of January, 1903, thirteen years after the resolution of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance which was passed in 1890—the 14th of February, a long time ago. In January, 1903, with our educational institutions at work during all that time, we are all more intelligent and better able to give the Finance Minister, new light on the trade routes of the country. The resolution sets forth :

"That this joint meeting of the board of trade and the citizens of Truro——"

Many of the leading men of the town, gathered to discuss this question. I heard there that day, some able speeches. I am reporting here the decision that was reached, with regard to this business proposition, at this meeting of business men, representing maritime provinces interests :

"That this joint meeting of the board of trade and citizens of Truro, having considered the question of another transcontinental railway on Canadian soil, is of opinion that one is immediately necessary, on account of the immense and rapidly increasing production of the North-west, which existing railways are entirely inadequate to transport. That we are of the opinion that the next railway to be built for the purpose should be located considerably north of the existing lines, so as not only to develop a new area of fertile lands, but also to insure the export business to Canadian ports only and thus prevent a recurrence of the disappointment which has been experienced by maritime provinces ports in the past.

"That such a line would also commend itself on account of the military defence of Canada :

"That the Trans-Canada Railway having adopted the route recommended by Sir Sandford Fleming, would seem to meet all requirements."

That is the modern deliverance, of the intelligent people of my town, and that I am prepared to support. Let me call the attention of the Minister of Finance to one thing. He knows Mr. Frederick Tupper. He ran in that county as a supporter of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) when he was Premier of the province. Mr.

Tupper is an intelligent and capable man. The only fault, he has, is that he is a Liberal. He is a justice of the peace in Truro. At this meeting, he made a speech, in moving a vote of thanks, to those who had taken part in that meeting, and, in the course of that speech, he declared plainly that no road should receive a subsidy that carried grain to a foreign port. He meant the Grand Trunk, and declared that, under no circumstances should they receive a subsidy, because their system, continued to carry the trade of this country to Portland. For that reason, he was prepared to support a railway that had no connection with the Grand Trunk. These were the words of a leading Liberal. Many of the leading Liberals of the Town were there. The hon. Minister of Finance, will know the names when I give them: J. C. B. Olive, E. A. Smith, A. O'Brien, S. G. Chambers—a warm friend and supporter of the hon. gentleman, and a financial agent of the Liberal party—S. D. McLellan, E. W. Hamilton, J. L. Sutherland. So, the Liberals, in this parliament from Nova Scotia, are bound and pledged, to carry out this resolution of the Board of Trade and citizens of Truro, instead of the mad scheme propounded by their leader.

THE MONCTON BOARD OF TRADE.

Now, the Moncton Board of Trade took up this matter, the board of trade, of the capital of the county, of my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson). And this Moncton will be a great ocean port, by force of Act of parliament, if this scheme goes through. I give notice that, when the time comes, I will move an amendment to have this ocean port, moved from Moncton to Truro. Instead of having a port 180 miles from the sea, it is far better to

have one that is only 62 miles from the sea. That is a mathematical proposition that, I am sure, hon. gentlemen will agree with. The Moncton Board of Trade considered this matter, and they passed the following resolution:

"Whereas, the transportation facilities of any country are a most important factor in the development of its industries and commerce, and

"Whereas, the Moncton Board of Trade is of the opinion that the time has arrived when another Canadian trans-continental railway should be constructed, through Canadian Territory and to Canadian seaports.

"Therefore resolved, that the Federal Government be asked to aid in the construction of such a line, enforcing stringent conditions that will ensure the entire traffic through Canadian ports both summer and winter. **And that no aid whatever be given to any company directing any portion of Canadian trade to foreign ports,** and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Minister of Railways."

That is the way they dealt with it—that not a dollar of subsidy, should be given to a road like the Grand Trunk. So, the hon. member for Westmoreland, is directed by his board of trade, to vote against this scheme, because the Grand Trunk are associated with it.

I have now shown you, that the whole business interests, of the maritime provinces, have sent us directions, not to support the policy of the government in this matter.

Hitherto, I have been dealing with this question from a national standpoint. That is the view that pleases me best. I am in the judgment of the House, when I say, that I am not sectional.

NOVA SCOTIA STANDPOINT.

But on an occasion like this, when a proposal is before us to build a great national line, I am bound to regard it in a sectional sense, I am bound to consider whether it answers for us in Nova Scotia, the intentions declared by the Prime Minister. Looking at this, from a Nova Scotia standpoint, then, one of the most fruitful objections, to this road, is, that the Grand Trunk Pacific is allied with the old Grand Trunk. The Prime Minister, made it the basis for a strong plea, for this scheme, that he had the Grand Trunk behind him. But it was quite the other way with it from a maritime point of view. We distrust the Grand Trunk. It has injured the business, of the maritime provinces, ever since Confederation. A prominent business man of Truro was sitting in the gallery this evening who if asked concerning it, would be able to tell you that the Grand Trunk's way of doing business for the maritime provinces had occasioned him much loss, during his business career. A Nova Scotia merchant gave an order for sugar on a rising market, the goods to be shipped from Ontario. In the ordinary course, the sugar should have been in his warehouse within ten days, and, had this been done, he would have made a profit of \$5,000 or \$10,000. But what happened? There is no competition between the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial, and so they side-tracked the sugar between Toronto and Montreal, and sent on cars, whose transport they regarded as more important. The sugar reached the consignee after twenty or thirty days, by which time the market had fallen and he made a serious loss. That is the way the merchants of the maritime provinces, have been treated by the Grand Trunk, during the whole course of their

experience with that road. So, when you prove that the Grand Trunk is connected with the scheme, you kill it, as far as the maritime provinces, are concerned. And when the government, come to discuss this matter with the people of the maritime provinces, they will find that they have made a mistake.

THE GRAND TRUNK.

Now, foreigners are studying our trade routes, and see the mistakes we are making. I find in the *Quarterly Review* an article which ably discusses the Grand Trunk. It says :

"Turning to the East, we find the Grand Trunk representing the consolidation of twenty-five companies. It is more American than Canadian."

That is the first thing a stranger notices about this corporation—it is more American than Canadian.

"It lies along the south-east border of the Dominion and has a western extension across the state of Michigan to Chicago.

"It pours its traffic from the West into New York and Boston by the Erie and New York Central Railways, via Buffalo and the Niagara suspension bridge. At Montreal, it crosses the St. Lawrence, and, traversing the State of Maine, reaches Portland, which it makes its principal Atlantic terminus. Its length, with its branches, is about 4,200 miles, which represent an expenditure of about £67,000,000 of English and Canadian capital. The American observes with satisfaction that this outlay has cemented Canadian interests very closely to those of the United States, and therefore, prays for further extensions of a railway system the main termini of which he so thoroughly controls."

Every American on this continent is praying for the success of this G. T. P. railway. How is it you people on the government benches, always have the support of the people of the United States, how is it that every scheme that you approve of, is also approved by every man in the United States? I would think, you would rather appeal to the sober common sense of the people of Canada, and get their approval for your conduct.

A GOLD BRICK.

Now, Sir, let me say that the Grand Trunk people have shown their hand in this matter, they have shown that they value their system in the United States, and are going to stand by it. They have been much more honest in their dealings with the people of Canada in this matter, than the government, because I undertake to say, that no intelligent man can read that contract and not say that the Grand Trunk Railway Company, have preserved their own interests at the expense of Canada; they have given the government of Canada notice: We are not going to desert our old lines in Canada or our terminals at Portland; we want to get into the West to get trade for that system and we are not going to have anything to do, with the Eastern portion of this proposed road. The Grand Trunk Railway, asked for a charter to build from North Bay to Winnipeg, then it was extended to Quebec, and the members of the committee insisted that it should be extended to Moncton and what happened? The Grand Trunk backed down absolutely. That ended the matter, and the Bill was withdrawn from the committee. When it again appeared in the committee, it was evident that the Grand Trunk had succeeded, they had won in the secret council. When they left, the Railway

Committee, they were willing to build from North Bay to Winnipeg, through a rough country; now they make the government build the line, not only to North Bay, but to Moncton, and then present the whole line to the company. The Grand Trunk railway have been honest. We know what took place in the council. Mr. Hays said: "I will have nothing to do with your Eastern portion, I have terminals at Portland, I have the old Grand Trunk system in which vast sums of money are invested, and I want to exploit the trade of the West, to benefit that system. I will have nothing to do with the Eastern section. I will, if you want me to, enter into a kind of an agreement with you to catch your supporters in the House." This proposition was unfortunately accepted by the government, but will not be accepted by the people. You cannot fool the people of this country; we live in a country where we have intelligence and the most careless elector, in my country, reading that agreement, will pitch it away and call it a gold brick. The Minister of Militia and Defence, cannot add one jot or tittle to the intelligence of the men in his county, nor can the Minister of Finance. They understand the whole trick, and I have received letters, from all parts of the maritime provinces, assuring me that the routing clause, which these gentlemen have held out as being a great advantage to the country, is a gold brick.

THE COMMERCIAL ENEMY OF CANADA.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we in the maritime provinces, regard the Grand Trunk, as the commercial enemy of Canada, and it is so regarded, not only in Canada, and the maritime provinces, but outside of Canada. Instead of helping Halifax, this railway

has always injured the trade of Halifax, and has endeavoured not only to side-track Halifax, but to side-track the ports of New Brunswick as well. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), during his speech let the cat out of the bag; I had the idea that this Grand Trunk was so securely anchored at Portland, as it is. The Minister of the Interior said—unrevised Hansard, page 8913—“The Grand Trunk Railway has a line from the city of Montreal to the city of Portland. It is a magnificent line of railway, well equipped in the best modern style, and it has terminal facilities which I am credibly told have cost from \$20,000,000 to \$25,000,000. We are told by the Grand Trunk people that the facilities which they have for doing business between Montreal and Portland are not sufficient now to cope with it.”

This company has used Canada, as a right-of-way, and as nothing more than a right-of-way. It has one terminal in Chicago, and one in Portland; it has a right of way over Canada, and exploits our trade, and takes our trade, through to Portland. Now, although they have expended \$25,000,000, in Portland, the minister states, that the president of the road, says, that they have not the required facilities there, which means that they will have to enlarge their terminals. I suppose, when they have succeeded in capturing our western trade, Portland will out-rival New York. We know the mistake, that has been made, and the enormous injury it has caused. We will have to fight them, and we will be prepared to fight, and will win in the end. After our experience with the Grand Trunk, the conduct of the government in putting the handling of our great Western trade, into the hands of this great company, is past all under-

standing. The government are well aware, of the opinion of every man in Canada, as to the Grand Trunk. That opinion has been expressed in parliament, and all over the country. It is regarded, as the one company, earmarked, as being hostile to the interests of Canada, and yet this government undertakes in inaugurating a great national scheme, to put it in the keeping of that railway, which is the enemy of Canada. To my mind, there is only one theory, by which it can be explained, and I do not want, to entertain that, for one moment.

THE EASTERN SECTION.

The agreement, about the working of the Eastern section, will be kept just as long as it is convenient for the Grand Trunk Pacific to keep it, in order to capture the trade of the West. But after they secure that trade, they will repudiate the agreement, and there is no power on earth to compel them to keep it, if they do not want. There was only one way, to make a transcontinental railway, a success; that was to charter a new company, and compel them to build a line from ocean to ocean, so that they would own the line, and have their money in it. Then, without compulsion, they would operate it like the Canadian Pacific Railway. Whenever a road is divided into two parts, as in this case, in which the government is allowing the Grand Trunk to own the prairie section, while the government carries the Eastern section, that very moment you destroy the system, and destroy the business of the maritime provinces.

NO MAN CAN SERVE TWO MASTERS.

We have learned in Nova Scotia, that no man can serve two masters, and the Grand Trunk cannot serve

Portland and Halifax. Many of the business men of Halifax are very disappointed and have asked us to oppose this scheme, because the Grand Trunk cannot, or will not promote the interests of that city.

THE INTERCOLONIAL.

The next objection, which as a maritime province man, I have to this scheme, is its connection with the Intercolonial. We do not wish any new line to connect with the Intercolonial. That is a question which is now being discussed by all the wide-awake electors of the maritime Provinces, and if this is done it is going to be a great disadvantage to that road. Suppose the trade of the West is ultimately hauled over this proposed line, then the I.C.R. from Halifax to Moncton, would be a Grand Trunk Pacific line, and not an Intercolonial line, because the greater will absorb the less, and Sir, the Intercolonial Railway from that time on, would be cut off at Moncton, and that railway which was intended as a basis of Confederation, one of the ribs of the constitution—that railway would be destroyed from Moncton to Halifax. We do not wish the Intercolonial Railway destroyed.

LEVER TO CONTROL RATES.

It is the only instrument we have to control rates, and we want this lever to remain. We do not want the Intercolonial Railway interfered with, but if this new company want to go to Halifax, let them go upon their own rails, and keep absolutely clear of the Intercolonial Railway. When, some years ago the Canadian Pacific Railway, tried to get possession of the Intercolonial Railway, although they promised to equip it as a first-class railway, the people of the maritime provinces rose up as one man, sent delegations to Ottawa, and

forbade the government, to place the Intercolonial Railway in any company's hands. We do not wish the Grand Trunk Pacific to obtain the Intercolonial Railway, and if it has to go to Halifax, let it go on its own rails, and leave the Intercolonial absolutely alone.

HANDS OFF THE I. C. R.

Hon. gentlemen from the maritime provinces, will find that the battle cry which has already been started is, "hands off the Intercolonial Railway." "Leave the Intercolonial Railway alone."

EQUIP THE I. C. R.

I am instructed, to ask parliament for money to double track the Intercolonial Railway, and to equip it in the best manner possible. We from the maritime provinces have been too modest. We have never had, that railway properly equipped. We should have taken a standard, from the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway systems in Ontario, and we should have equipped the Intercolonial Railway in the best fashion possible, so as to make it the great trade route, between the maritime provinces and the West. That road should be maintained, in the highest state of efficiency. We have been content to allow the Intercolonial Railway to be dragged down, and then hon. gentlemen on the other side, come to parliament and say that the Intercolonial Railway does not pay. The Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway, would not have paid, if either of these roads had been equipped with light rails, and poor cars and engines. Let us equip the Intercolonial Railway, and put the people's road, in a position to secure the trade for the maritime provinces.

THE HON. MEMBER FOR CUMBERLAND.

I am bound, to take some objection, to the exploitation made by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) of my county in respect to this question. I have no doubt that there is a great conspiracy, in Nova Scotia, in regard to this ocean to ocean railway. I have no doubt, that when this railway was projected, when the terminus was fixed at Moncton, there was an agreement, entered into between the Liberals of Nova Scotia to this effect. If they left this railway at Moncton, every man in Nova Scotia, representing a Liberal constituency, could go into his county and say that the reason that the terminus of this railway, had been left at Moncton, was that the ocean port, may afterwards be established in his county. For instance, the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) can go into his county, and say that the terminus had been left at Moncton, in order that the ocean port eventually may be established at Country Harbour. The hon. member for Victoria, N.S. (Hon. Mr. Ross) will go into his constituency and say: I had this road stopped at Moncton, because then, in a very short time, it will be extended from Moncton to Louisburg or North Sydney. He will claim, that there is a secret understanding, that the great ocean port, is going to be at Louisburg or North Sydney. I am glad to see the hon. member for Cumberland here, because I am dealing with the splendid exploitation which he has made in my county. The hon. gentleman evidently has an understanding with some gentleman in my county, who expects to run at the next election, in the Liberal interests, and is trying to clear his path.

FIVE ISLANDS OR TRURO.

He is going to have the railway carried through my county. He says, that they may double track the Intercolonial, and that they may take this railway, through my county and make Five Islands or Truro the winter port. I suppose that when the election comes on, my hon. friend will come over and say, that the government have determined to make Five Islands a winter port. My county marches with the Cobequid Bay for 40 or 50 miles, and I do not know what port will be selected. That is a splendid suggestion, for the hon. member for Cumberland to make, and it is one so much in my interest perhaps, that I am going to ask him to vote for a proposition, that I will move, that the road shall be extended from the proposed terminus at Moncton to Truro via Five Islands. A local election was being run in that county, and the hon. member for Cumberland came to help his friends.

A TRUNK FULL OF KITES.

He has the reputation, of having a trunk full of kites, and this telegram was sent to him: "Come over and bring your kites. We have need of them in this county." He came over and he asked the people if they wanted the railway extended to Five Islands? This was only four or five days before the election, and he said, that the only trouble was, that the people had not given notice of their desires soon enough. He said: "If you had given notice two or three weeks ago, we would have had the railway fairly started by this time. Mr. Cowan of Springhill will come over here and build you a railway and Mr. Tucker will come over and build a railway. Both these gentlemen are languishing

"to build you railways." When I told the people, that the hon. gentleman was a kite flyer, they said, with such an honest and sincere looking face, that was impossible. Surely he meant what he said, when he told us that they were going on to build that railway. The result was that the gentlemen he came over to support, were elected by a small majority, because there was a considerable change in that section of the country, owing to these promises. I will read what the hon. gentleman said the other day in this House, because I do not wish, to misrepresent, so benevolent a gentleman, as the hon. member for Cumberland :

"Mr. Hays has stated, and he should be in a position to speak, that there will be traffic enough to supply half a dozen harbours."

When he goes down to Nova Scotia, he will be able to say, that we discussed all these matters in parliament. There will be a line to Five Islands, and one to Pictou. I have here an interview with Mr. E. M. MacDonald, who is likely to be an opponent of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell). He had, been here during this debate, and when he got back to Pictou, he said, that he was going to have the line extended from Moncton to Pictou. I anticipate that he is going to have a line to Pictou, and the great ocean port there.

GOOD OLD COLCHESTER.

I suppose that I might equally claim the same for the county of Colchester. But I happen to be in parliament, and can move an amendment to test the sincerity of the hon. member for Cumberland and the government he supports, in reference to making Five Islands or Truro the winter port; and I

propose to do it before this debate is over. Then we will see where the hon. gentlemen opposite are, in reference to the good old county of Colchester. I think the hon. member from Cumberland, will conclude, before all is over, that he spoke too quickly.

Mr. LOGAN. Does the hon. gentleman propose to parallel the Intercolonial Railway from Moncton to Truro ?

Mr. GOURLEY. Don't bother me about paralleling lines. I will parallel them every twelve miles; I think that is about the proper distance, that railways should be apart, in Canada. If you gentlemen over there, furnish the money, I will tell you where to build the railways.

THE ROUTING CLAUSE.

I proceed to show now, that the government knew, the weakness of their scheme, and it is only because they knew their system was broken in two, that they put this routing clause in the contract. If the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, were not tied up with the old Grand Trunk Railway, there would be no necessity for any routing clause, because then the whole Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system, and every man connected with it, would be anxious to send every pound of freight, to their port in the maritime provinces. Look at the unscientific and illogical way, in which that clause is drawn. Why it is a stump speech. That clause was never drawn by a lawyer. There is not a cheap stump speaker in Nova Scotia, who could not use more apt English, than is used in that clause. In a great contract dealing with transcontinental interests, this is nothing but the cheapest buncombe. Listen to it :

"It is hereby declared and agreed between the parties to this agreement that the aid herein provided for, is granted by the government of Canada for the express purpose of encouraging the development of Canadian trade and the transportation of goods through Canadian channels."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, order.

Mr. GOURLEY. These gentlemen on the other side of the House should have some self-respect.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, order.

Mr. GOURLEY. I was showing, Sir, the absurd language, in which this contract was drawn. On the face of it, it showed that it was intended, to humbug, the people of the maritime provinces. I cannot believe, that the Minister of Justice, would use such meaningless language, in an Act of parliament. He was drawing up a great contract, which might involve the expenditure of \$200,000,000, and I cannot imagine him using such buncombe as that with regard to the routing of the freight. I hope it was not the Minister of Justice who drew that clause. If he did, then he is mistaken, if he thinks that the people of the maritime provinces, will be misled by such cheap declamation. The language used in that section is the merest clap-trap of the political stage, and should never appear in a statute. I have read you the buncombe on one side, and here is the buncombe on the other :

"The company accepts the aid on these conditions and agrees that all freight originating on the line of the railway, or its branches, **not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper**, shall, when destined for points

in Canada be carried entirely on Canadian territory, or between Canadian inland ports, and that the through rate on export traffic from the point of origin to the point of destination shall at no time be greater via Canadian ports than via United States ports, and that all such traffic, **not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper**, shall be carried to Canadian ocean ports."

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is nothing more than a stump speech incorporated into a solemn Act of parliament. It will never mislead the people of the maritime provinces. One business man told me that the government had better strike it out, because anyway, it simply means that the freight will go to Portland, and it would be more honest to strike it out and write in Portland.

For thirty years, we have been trying in the maritime provinces, to secure a transcontinental railway to carry the traffic of the west, to our maritime ports; and do you think that for a moment we will be gold-bricked, by nonsense in an Act of parliament, that no respectable boy in the maritime provinces, would use from the public platform, in the most excitable moments of political debate.

And here is worse buncombe, if possible, than what I have read. The 43rd clause of the agreement says:

"The company further agrees that it shall not, in any matter within its power, directly or indirectly advise or encourage the transportation of such freight by routes other than those above provided, but shall, in all respects in good faith, use its utmost endeavours to fulfil the conditions upon which public aid is granted, namely,—the development of trade through Canadian channels and Canadian ocean ports."

THE SINNER.

That is the prayer of the sinner "*in extremis*." When the government, inserted that clause, they put it in, as a pious supplication, that the people of Canada would not look at their infamous transaction and criticise it too closely. The merchants of Nova Scotia, know exactly the meaning of that clause and not a man of them will be deceived. The Prime Minister told us, that the mixing up of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, with the old Grand Trunk, was a strong point in his scheme, but I say it is a wretched blot upon the scheme, both from the financial and national point of view. The Grand Trunk Railway Company is a bankrupt concern; it does not pay interest on its securities. It has been a defaulter for thirty or forty years; and when a company cannot pay a hundred cents on the dollar, it does not give weight to any financial scheme. The whole contract, is an exploitation to get the votes of the Grand Trunk, and nothing more.

A STRIKING COMMENTARY.

What a striking commentary, that routing clause is, upon an ocean-to-ocean line. If this had been really an ocean-to-ocean line, that foolish clause would not have been necessary. I think my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), in the course of his able speech, suggested that every official of the Grand Trunk, would use his influence to have the freight routed in the interests of the company. I think that is a very mild suggestion. I think no official of the company, in the North-West, will have to mention anything of that kind to any man there. I lived in the North-West and had to do business with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I had to study the interests of that company and inquire how my

interests would be served by serving them. Every man, and every child, in the North West, doing business with the Grand Trunk Railway, will know the effect of this routing clause—will know that the Grand Trunk are compelled to accept the same rate to Halifax as to Portland; and therefore every man will know, that it is in the interests of the Grand Trunk, to have the freight, routed to Portland, and will act accordingly.

TELEGRAM FROM HALIFAX.

I received to-day a telegram from the Board of Trade of Halifax, which I will take the liberty of reading :

Halifax, N.S., Aug. 31, 1903.
S. E. Gourley, M.P.,

Ottawa.

Halifax Board of Trade reaffirming resolutions of May 23rd and July 22nd, urges that government embody in contract that Grand Trunk Pacific line between Moncton and Quebec must be built concurrent with Western divisions, and further urges that clause relating to routing of shipments be so amended that all shipments originating in Canada for export must be carried through Canadian termini summer and winter.

J. E. DEWOLF, President.

CHAS. M. CREED, Secretary.

Every man in the Halifax Board of Trade, is fully aware that this routing clause is a fatal error; and they ask that it be made absolute and imperative, otherwise it is not of the slightest use to the maritime provinces.

AN AMENDMENT.

I have undertaken to put an amendment on the Order paper, to that effect, which I intend to press, and which I hope will meet with the approval of the government.

COUNTRY HARBOUR.

In passing, I wish to say one word to the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). I am sorry he is not here. He has got paid for the part he has taken in this scheme, because I see the following interview in the Halifax Morning Chronicle of August 27 :

"It does not look now as though we would build a road from the west to Nova Scotia. The government has decided on the Grand Trunk Pacific and there is not room for two." Such was the assertion made to a reporter for the "Chronicle," last evening by Mr. D. D. Mann, of the firm of Mackenzie & Mann, who is at present in the city in connection with matters pertaining to the Halifax and South-Western Railway."

"Mr. Mann intimated strongly that his firm had abandoned the idea of making County Harbour their Eastern terminus and that they would not, at least for a number of years, have a transcontinental railway."

The hon. member for Guysborough, by dickering with this scheme, has lost the chance of Mackenzie & Mann, making Country Harbour their maritime port, and he will gain no advantage from this. I offer my sincere sympathy to the hon. member for Guysborough.

THE STRATEGICAL VIEW.

The American people have noticed the defect in our whole railway system. They have noticed, the weakness of it, passing through that narrow section of country 65 miles wide, between Lake Winnipeg and the Manitoba border. The result is, that they are talking of our country, being defenceless, in a military sense. It is defenceless, so long as that weakness

remains. I see in "Harper's Weekly," a paper not given to undue excitement, the following statement, in the issue of June 13 last :

"There is still another point of view from which it might be well for Englishmen to consider Mr. Chamberlain's proposal. If, in order to conciliate Canada and Australia, they erect a wall against the food products of the United States, they cannot reasonably expect to keep American good-will. Yet, to forfeit American good-will would virtually be to commit national suicide. It is obvious that, were we unfriendly to England, she could not in war time procure an ounce of food products from the North-West provinces of the Dominion, because we should cut the railways connecting that region with the seaboard.

"The consolidation of the British empire by means of a protective tariff is a chimera. The non-agricultural majority of the British population will never alienate the foreign consumers of their manufactures in order to propitiate colonial agriculturists. They now know, or they soon will recognize, that such a programme would mean ruin. England's sole hope of salvation is in winning and keeping the good-will of the United States."

The Americans, understand exactly, the weakness of our position, and while this condition remains, we are placed at a great disadvantage, in case of any difficulty arising.

NOVA SCOTIA RAILWAYS.

Let me say one word with reference to railways in Nova Scotia. If I were speaking in a sectional sense, I should oppose this measure, because in an expenditure of \$200,000,000, there

is not one mile added to the railways of Nova Scotia. Look at the record of the railways in the various provinces of Canada: At the close of 1902, the mileage for the different provinces stood as follows:

	Miles.
Ontario	7,139
Quebec	3,445
Manitoba	2,128
North-West and Yukon Territories	2,080
New Brunswick	1,444
British Columbia	1,372
Nova Scotia	1,051
P. E. Island	209
Total	18,868

We have the smallest mileage, by far in the whole Dominion of Canada, barring Prince Edward Island. Nova Scotia, the oldest province of the Dominion, has been most shamefully treated by this government; and I for one protest, in the name of the people of Nova Scotia at this state of affairs.

RAILWAYS IN COLCHESTER.

We want railways in Colchester County. We want a railway from Truro to Five Islands and Parrsboro', a distance of 65 miles; we want a railway from Brookfield to Eastville, 40 miles; and we want a railway from Truro to North Shore, 35 miles; to give our county some opportunity to mingle in the trade routes of the world. We cannot get a mile of these railways, and yet \$200,000,000 are to be flung into the sea, in order to exploit this system, which after all will not possess the character of an ocean-to-ocean road.

AN ATLANTIC PORT.

I say the first duty, of this government, should be, to select some port on the Atlantic coast. They selected

Port Simpson on the Pacific, and that was right.

If you want to build a transcontinental line, surely you should have an Atlantic port. You should select some port, and devote your whole attention to exploiting it. What is the trouble with Montreal to-day? The difficulty is that it takes four or five days to unload, and four or five days more to load, a ship, whereas in New York, you can load or unload in three or four hours. If you want to build up the maritime provinces, you will have to select one harbour. The government should be strong enough to select Halifax, and exploit that port. Expend \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000, and put that port in a position to compete with New York. Unless you do that you cannot dominate the trade. Montreal and Quebec will not be competitors, unless you equip those ports, in the same way as New York and Boston are equipped.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I would like to get from the hon. gentleman an expression of his opinion with respect to the subsidizing of railways in Nova Scotia. Does he agree with the declaration made by some of his leaders that the subsidizing in the other provinces should cease?

Mr. GOURLEY. My views are too well known to need re-statement. We have differed before on these matters. I know what views my party leaders hold; but the hon. gentleman does not know what views his hold. Personally, I am a strong advocate of subsidizing railways; and I feel sure that my leader and party take the same view.

I shall not detain the House longer, but wish to thank hon. members for the very courteous attention they have given my remarks.

at

n-
n
e
n
e
y
-
d,
n
o.
e
z
e
l
o
a
e